



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 16, 1999

No. 41

House of Representatives

The House met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 16, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CONSTANCE A. MORELLA to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) for 2 minutes.

IN HONOR OF JAMES C. KIRKPATRICK

Mr. SKELTON. Madam Speaker, today I join the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) in paying tribute to the late James C. Kirkpatrick. The memory of Jim Kirkpatrick will be honored this week with the dedication of a library named for him at Central Missouri State University in Warrensburg, Missouri. This is certainly a fitting tribute to a great Missourian who served our neighbors so well through the years as Missouri's Secretary of State.

Actually, I inherited my friendship with Jim Kirkpatrick, as he was a close friend of my father's through the years. Back in 1932, when my father ran for Attorney General, Jim Kirkpatrick, then editor of the Windsor newspaper, endorsed him.

When I served in the Missouri State Senate, I had close contact with Jim Kirkpatrick, who was then serving as Secretary of State. Filing for election and reelection with him was always a memorable occasion.

America is always in need of role models for those who enter public service. Jim Kirkpatrick was such a role model, putting the people's business first, running an efficient office, and having a warm greeting for all with whom he came in contact. He was a model of integrity.

We all miss Jim Kirkpatrick, but his name and his example will live on with the building being named in his memory at CMSU.

IN HONOR OF JAMES C. KIRKPATRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) is recognized during morning hour debates for 2 minutes.

Mr. BLUNT. Madam Speaker, there are many memories that come to mind when I think of Missouri's longest serving Secretary of State, Jim Kirkpatrick, of Warrensburg, Missouri. There was the quick laugh and sparkling eyes that often calmed a political confrontation. There was the always present Irish green tie, the green jacket, the green stationery, the green ink, the green furniture. In fact, everything in the Secretary of State's office when I had the privilege to follow him there was some shade of green.

It is a privilege for me today, the only Republican elected Secretary of State in Missouri in the last seven dec-

ades, to join with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) as we honor the memory of Missouri's "Mr. Democrat" as its most Irish politician this week of Saint Patrick's Day.

Many Missourians remember Jim Kirkpatrick working to establish statewide voter registration, directing two winning campaigns for better roads, and championing the establishment of a records management and archives division in State government.

Jim Kirkpatrick instinctively understood Tip O'Neill's axiom that all politics is local, as he crisscrossed the State for two decades eagerly meeting with citizens wherever he went.

Others remember Jim Kirkpatrick and his newspapers. He worked his way up to be the editor of the Warrensburg Daily Star-Journal. He then moved to edit the Jefferson City News and Tribune. He was the publisher of the Windsor Review and Lamar Daily Democrat. It was Missouri Governor Forrest Smith who first brought him into State government as his administrative assistant in 1948.

What I remember most about him was he put "service" in public service. When he left office after five terms, his commitment to the people of Missouri and to the job done by the Secretary of State's office was as strong as ever. He continued to dedicate himself to the efforts of his office during his last week as a State official with the same concern that I am sure he had during his first week.

In 1985, Jim retired to Warrensburg and to the campus of Central Missouri State University, where he graduated, served on the Board of Regents and led in effort after effort.

His office in the Ward Edwards Library was the replica of his office in the State capitol. His lectures to the students were high points for them and him. Jim and his wife traveled with campus groups, went to hundreds of campus events, and were involved in

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1269

the community as a great team until Jim's death.

Next week, the campus and the community will officially dedicate the new James C. Kirkpatrick Library at Central Missouri State University. Jim Kirkpatrick's legacy of service continues.

ELIMINATE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST PUERTO RICAN CITIZENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Madam Speaker, I rise this morning with a heavy heart. While I congratulate my colleagues for the fine manner in which they debated the deployment of American troops to Kosovo on the floor, I must also point out a great injustice in our American democratic system.

Last Thursday, throughout the discussion on the floor, precisely at this podium where I now stand, what my esteemed colleagues debated was the reaffirmation of the Congress' power as the sovereign representative body of all Americans.

On a bipartisan level, the debate reflected important concerns about the authority that Congress exercises on the issues that affect our Nation and our standing in the world. It is to this House's great credit and a decision that in my estimation marks a significant turning point in Congressional relations that my colleagues overcame party differences and acted in unison to enable our troops to join NATO forces in Kosovo.

The deployment of American troops to any conflict is an issue of critical importance to all Americans. It is critical not only for the soldier who is the individual facing the greatest danger and may be called upon to sacrifice his or her life, but also for every one of the American families, the wives and husbands, parents, and children, or even the friends.

In short, it is critical for all who will sacrifice the companionship of their loved ones, who will be sent to a far-away place to defend liberty and freedom according to the best interests of our Nation.

I have the deepest admiration for our troops who place themselves in harm's way and do so willingly, because they commit their lives to our Nation in defense of democracy. This is what patriotism is all about. From the depths of my heart, I salute our troops for their commitment to their fellow citizens and our Nation and ask God to protect them and bless them wherever they are.

Throughout the debate of the House, I feel deeply troubled by the fact that, in all likelihood, the troops to be deployed to Kosovo will include many American citizens from Puerto Rico and yet I, as their sole representative

in the Congress of the United States, was unable to vote in the decision that could place their lives in peril.

How is it possible that the Nation that acts as the supreme defender of freedom, liberty, and rights everywhere in the world maintains a policy that does not extend those rights to all of its citizens? The ugly reality is that some of the soldiers who defend our American democracy do not possess the right to vote by virtue of living in a territory.

To me, it is tragically clear that what the United States is telling these soldiers is that, yes, you must place your life on the line to defend American values. Yes, you must go to a foreign country as a member of the peace-keeping troops. Yes, you must fight, if called to fight, and you may even die, but, no, your opinion does not count because the Congressman that represents you cannot exert the right to vote that may place your life in harm's way.

Last Thursday, I heard many of my colleagues affirm the Congress' power as the sovereign representative of the body of all Americans and was saddened that this representation is not equal for all Americans.

It is not a proud moment for our country when we muzzle American citizens and hold them in abeyance. After all, is this not the reason our troops are going over there? How come we continue to ask them to defend rights that they themselves do not possess despite a century of partnership and 83 years of American citizenship?

Can we as a democratic nation afford to continue to support discrimination, disenfranchisement against the 3.8 million Americans in Puerto Rico? The American soldiers from Puerto Rico and their loved ones commit their lives to the cause of freedom and democracy as willingly and patriotically as any one of their fellow citizens in the 50 States. Should we not affirm their full rights in Congress?

Madam Speaker, I call on all of my colleagues to join us in our quest to eliminate disenfranchisement and discrimination against the American citizens in Puerto Rico. No less is possible and no less can be expected from our democracy.

NATIONAL SECURITY CONCERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Madam Speaker, I wish that I did not have to rise this morning on this topic, and yesterday I am shocked by the emperor's new clothes mentality that engulfs our Nation's Capitol on issues as vital as our national security.

For, indeed, Madam Speaker, from the same crowd who would have us believe that there is another definition

for the word "alone," from the same bunch who would say, well, that depends on what the meaning of "is" is, today, Madam Speaker, we have a new definition of "swiftly".

For according to the weekend talk shows, to hear Secretary of Energy Richardson and National Security Advisor Berger talk, they claim that this administration acted swiftly to try and counteract the intelligence breaches and espionage at our national laboratory at Los Alamos. Yet, this is the same crowd that, in the previous year, in an afternoon was able to clear out the White House Travel Office on a spurious charge of messing with the petty cash drawer, and yet it took this administration 3 long years to react to the first reports of an intelligence breach, Mr. Berger, notified in 1996 of the problem, apparently failing to take action.

Indeed this morning, Madam Speaker, on the front page of the Washington Times the report is as follows, "Security remains weak at U.S. nuclear labs despite the uncovering in 1995 of Chinese espionage efforts, says a recently retired U.S. counterintelligence official. His detailed firsthand knowledge contradicts President Clinton's claims that security has been tight." Quoting now, "Security at the Department of Energy has not improved." This former official told the Washington Times, indeed.

In yesterday's New York Times, columnist Bill Safire asked this question, "Why, if Secretary Bill Richardson were so 'seized of' this secret issue last August when he was named, did he demote the expert, Trulock, and put in charge a CIA man from his UN embassy staff, Larry Sanchez, who knew nothing about the agency's worst problem?"

Safire also writes, "It would be outrageous indeed to suggest that American officials were consciously betraying our national interest. But the confluence of these facts in election year 1996, combined with the urge to disregard or derogate any intelligence that would stop the political blessings of a 'strategic partnership' with China, led to Clinton's denial of a dangerous penetration."

Madam Speaker, indeed, the distinguished senior Senator from my home State, Senator JOHN MCCAIN, in a major foreign policy speech yesterday spoke more on this topic, this curious timing of illegal campaign contributions to the Clinton-Gore campaign in 1996. My senior Senator said, and I quote, "Sadly that charge grows more credible every day. And if it is proven beyond a reasonable doubt it will bring more of history's shame upon the President than his personal failings will, indeed greater shame than any President has ever suffered."

Madam Speaker, we acknowledge the obvious. We acknowledge that, sadly, in this town at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, there are some people who are beyond shame. Madam Speaker, our Vice President who last week

claimed that he was father of the Internet also gave us a very curious interpretation when he claimed that, because this espionage may have started in the 1980s, someone else was to blame.

Madam Speaker, if we are to use that as our standard, then I suppose we should blame Lyndon Johnson for the Navy spy ring that began its espionage in 1968. No, Madam Speaker, espionage is a serious charge and is a serious problem that we deplore at any time. But the challenge is not when it started but when we chose to do something about it once we had the knowledge.

Again, our President speaks of a strategic partnership with China. We know now in the fullness of time exactly what his strategic partnership meant. Take a look at the record. Take a look at the videotapes. Leaders of the People's Liberation Army and Chinese business interests giving to the Clinton-Gore campaign?

Madam Speaker, even though, in this environment of the emperor's new clothes, let me step forward as did the young girl in that tale by Hans Christian Andersen and say this, it is illegal, it is unpardonable, it is unconscionable for an American administration to take money from foreign governments.

□ 0945

WE MUST NOT PRIVATIZE MEDICARE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, the National Bipartisan Commission on the Future of Medicare is poised today to vote on a proposal that would end Medicare as we know it.

The Commission's charge was to come up with a scheme for putting Medicare on solid financial footing and improving its value to seniors. They definitely came up with a scheme, a scheme to privatize America's best government program.

Under the Commission proposal, known as Premium Support, Medicare would no longer pay directly for health care services. Instead, it would provide each senior with a voucher good for part of the premium for their private health insurance coverage. Medicare beneficiaries could use this voucher to buy into the fee-for-service plan sponsored by the Federal Government or to join a private plan.

To encourage consumer price sensitivity, the voucher would track to the lowest cost private plan. Seniors then would shop for the best plan that best suits their needs, paying the balance of the premium and paying extra if they want higher quality health care. The Commission proposal creates a system of health coverage but it abandons Medicare's bedrock principle of egalitarianism.

Today, Medicare is income blind. All seniors have access to the same level of health care. The Commission proposal, however, is structured to provide comprehensiveness, access and quality only to those who can afford them.

The idea that vouchers will empower seniors to choose a health plan that best suits their needs is quite simply a myth. The reality is that seniors will be forced to accept whatever plan they can afford.

The Medicare Commission is charged with ensuring Medicare's long-term solvency. This proposal will not do that. Proponents of the voucher plan say it would shave off 1 percent of the Medicare budget per year over the next few decades. It will only do that by charging senior citizens more. In fact, Bruce Vladeck, a Commission member and former Medicare administrator, doubts Premium Support will save the government even a dime.

The privatization of Medicare is nothing new. Medicare beneficiaries have been able to enroll in private managed Medicare plans for some time now, and their experience does not bode well for a full-fledged privatization effort. Managed care plans are profit oriented, and the theory that they can sustain significantly lower costs than traditional Medicare simply has not panned out.

Profit-driven managed care plans do not tough it out when those profits are unrealized. Last year, 96 Medicare HMOs deserted 400,000 Medicare beneficiaries because the HMOs' customers did not meet the HMOs' profit objectives.

Before the Medicare program was launched in 1965, more than one-half of America's senior citizens did not have health insurance. Private insurance was the only option then for seniors. Insurers simply did not want seniors to join their plans because they knew the elderly would use much of their coverage. The private insurance market still avoids high-risk enrollees and, whenever possible, dodges the bill for high cost medical services.

What is perhaps most disturbing about the Commission's Premium Support plan is what it does not tell us. It does not tell us how we can make Medicare more efficient while still preserving its egalitarian underpinnings. It does not tell us how much the Nation can or wants to spend on health care for seniors. It does not give us options for reconciling what the Nation wants with how much we have or are willing to spend.

If we privatize Medicare, like the Commission wants, we are telling America that not all seniors deserve the same level of care. The wisest course for the Medicare Commission is to disband without delivering a final product. We should go back to the drawing board and we should construct a plan that builds on Medicare's strengths and ensures its long-term solvency. Selling off Medicare to the managed care industry is the easy way out and it is wrong.

REPUBLICAN AGENDA IS TO STRENGTHEN SCHOOLS, LOWER TAXES AND SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. WELLER. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House this morning.

I have the privilege of representing a diverse district. I represent the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs and Cook and Will Counties, bedroom communities like Morris, the town where I live, and a lot of corn fields and farm towns. Representing such a diverse district of city and suburbs and country, I have learned to listen, to try to find the common concerns and ideas and suggestions of the folks back home.

I find one very common message whether I am in the city, the suburbs or the country, and that is that the folks back home want us to work together to find solutions, and they are looking for real accomplishments as we face the issues that are before us here in the Congress.

I am proud to say that over the last 4 years this Congress has met that challenge. I am pretty proud of what we have accomplished over the last 4 years. We did some things that people told us that we could not do. We balanced the budget for the first time in 28 years, we cut taxes for the middle class for the first time in 16 years, we reformed welfare for the first time in a generation, and we tamed the IRS for the first time ever. Those are real accomplishments.

I find as I talk about those accomplishments, folks say, well, that is pretty good, but what will the Congress do next? What are the next challenges? Where will we look to find solutions for in Washington that really matter to the folks back home? And I find as I listen to the concerns of the folks back home, they really offer a simple series of questions and a simple agenda that they want us to be working on here.

My constituents tell me they want good schools, they want low taxes, and they want a secure retirement, and that is our agenda here in this Congress, I am proud to say. Our agenda, particularly on the Republican side, is simple, just like the agenda of the folks back home. We want to strengthen our local schools, making sure that our dollars get into the classroom and that our schools are run by local school boards and local school administrators and local teachers and local parents. We want to lower taxes, recognizing the tax burden has never been higher than it is today. We want to help the middle class by allowing them to keep more of what they earn, because they can spend it better than we can for them here in Washington. We also want to provide for a secure retirement by saving Social Security and rewarding retirement savings.

It is an important agenda, but it is a simple agenda, and that is our focus this year. But we also have another challenge and another opportunity before us. Thanks to the fiscal responsibilities of this Congress, we balanced the budget for the first time in 28 years. We have now produced a surplus of extra tax revenue, an estimated \$2.6 trillion of extra money. It is burning a hole in Washington's pocket and a lot of people want to spend it. The challenge and the opportunity really is what do we do and how do we do the right thing?

The President gave a great speech back in January in his State of the Union. He said a lot of great sounding things. He said we should take 62 percent of this surplus, this extra tax revenue, and use it for Social Security. That sounded pretty good. But if we look at the fine print, that 62 percent means he wants to spend the rest on new government.

Now, we Republicans want to take a different approach. We say we want to take 100 percent of the Social Security money and use it for Social Security. The money that is left over, the income tax surplus, we want to use for other purposes. But the reason that is important to point out is because when the President says 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security, what he is not telling us is that he wants to take \$250 billion in Social Security surplus trust fund monies and spend them on other purposes.

Now, back home, the senior citizens that I have the privilege of representing on the south side of Chicago and the south suburbs and rural Illinois tell me that is called raiding the Social Security Trust Fund. The President wants to raid the Social Security Trust Fund by \$250 billion. We on the Republican side of the aisle want to put a stop to that. We believe that 100 percent of the Social Security Trust Fund should go to Social Security. That is the contract of Social Security. We believe it is time to wall off the Social Security Trust Fund so that Social Security dollars only go to Social Security, as they were promised when we all paid our payroll taxes.

Also, I want to point out that in the first few years of the surplus that almost 100 percent of that surplus, extra tax revenue, is Social Security Trust Fund dollars. So when someone wants to create new government programs, they are borrowing, as they would say, or raiding, as senior citizens would say, to create new government. They are raiding the Social Security trust funds. We need to keep an eye on that.

We also need to look at the tax burden, recognizing that the folks back home who tell me they want lower taxes, to see why the tax burden is so high today. I have been told that for the average family in Illinois that almost 40 percent of the average Illinois family's income today goes to government. We need to lower taxes.

Let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty, let us save Social Security,

and let us wall off the Social Security Trust Fund.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to highlight what is arguably the most unfair provision in the U.S. Tax code: the marriage tax penalty. I want to thank you for your long term interest in bringing parity to the tax burden imposed on working married couples compared to a couple living together outside of marriage.

Many may recall in January, President Clinton gave his State of the Union Address outlining many of the things he wants to do with the budget surplus. Although we were prepared to dedicate 90 percent of the budget surplus to saving Social Security, we agree with the President that at least 62% of the Budget Surplus must be used to save Social Security.

A surplus provided by the bipartisan budget agreement which: cut waste, put America's fiscal house in order, and held Washington's feet to the fire to balance the budget.

While President Clinton paraded a long list of new spending for new big government programs—we believe that a top priority after saving Social Security and paying down the national debt should be returning the budget surplus to America's families as additional middle-class tax relief.

This Congress has given more tax relief to the middle class and working poor than any Congress of the last half century.

I think the issue of the marriage penalty can best be framed by asking these questions: Do Americans feel it is fair that our tax code imposes a higher tax penalty on marriage? Do Americans feel it is fair that the average married working couple pays almost \$1,400 more in taxes than a couple with almost identical income living together outside of marriage? Is it right that our tax code provides an incentive to get divorced?

In fact, today the only form one can file to avoid the marriage tax penalty is paperwork for divorce. And that is just wrong!

Since 1969, our tax laws have punished married couples when both spouses work. For no other reason than the decision to be joined in holy matrimony, more than 21 million couples a year are penalized. They pay more in taxes than they would if they were single. Not only is the marriage penalty unfair, it's wrong that our tax code punishes society's most basic institution. The marriage tax penalty exacts a disproportionate toll on working women and lower income couples with children. In many cases it is a working women's issue.

Let me give you an example of how the marriage tax penalty unfairly affects middle class married working couples.

For example, a machinist, at a Caterpillar manufacturing plant in my home district of Joliet, makes \$31,500 a year in salary. His wife is a tenured elementary school teacher, also bringing home \$31,500 a year in salary. If they would both file their taxes as singles, as individuals, they would pay 15%.

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE

	Machinist	School teacher	Couple	H.R. 6
Adjusted gross income	\$31,500	\$31,500	\$63,000	\$63,000
Less personal exemption and standard deduction	\$6,950	\$6,950	\$12,500	\$13,900 (Singles x 2)
Taxable income	\$24,550 (x .15)	\$24,550 (x .15)	\$50,500 (Partial x .28)	\$49,100 (x .15)

MARRIAGE PENALTY EXAMPLE—Continued

	Machinist	School teacher	Couple	H.R. 6
Tax liability	\$3,682.5	\$3,682.5	\$8,635	\$7,365
Marriage penalty			\$1,270	
Relief				\$1,270

But if they chose to live their lives in holy matrimony, and now file jointly, their combined income of \$61,000 pushes them into a higher tax bracket of 28 percent, producing a tax penalty of \$1,400 in higher taxes.

On average, America's married working couples pay \$1,400 more a year in taxes than individuals with the same incomes. That's serious money. Millions of married couples are still stinging from April 15th's tax bite and more married couples are realizing that they are suffering the marriage tax penalty.

Particularly if you think of it in terms of: a down payment on a house or a car, one year's tuition at a local community college, or several months worth of quality child care at a local day care center.

To that end, U.S. Representative DAVID MCINTOSH (R-IN) and U.S. Representative PAT DANNER (D-MO) and I have authored H.R. 6, The Marriage Tax Elimination Act.

H.R. 6, *The Marriage Tax Elimination Act* will increase the tax brackets (currently at 15% for the first \$24,650 for singles, whereas married couples filing jointly pay 15% on the first \$41,200 of their taxable income) to twice that enjoyed by singles. H.R. 6 would extend a married couple's 15% tax bracket to \$49,300. Thus married couples would enjoy an additional \$8,100 in taxable income subject to the low 15% tax rate as opposed to the current 28% tax rate and would result in up to \$1,215 in tax relief.

Additionally the bill will increase the standard deduction for married couples (currently \$6,900) to twice that of singles (currently at \$4,150). Under H.R. 6 the standard deduction for married couples filing jointly would be increased to \$8,300.

H.R. 6 is enjoys the bipartisan support of 230 co-sponsors along with family groups, including: American Association of Christian Schools, American Family Association, Christian Coalition, Concerned Women for America, Ethics and Religious Liberty Commission of the Southern Baptist Convention, Family Research Council, Home School Legal Defense Association, the National Association of Evangelicals and the Traditional Values Coalition.

It isn't enough for President Clinton to suggest tax breaks for child care. The President's child care proposal would help a working couple afford, on average, three weeks of day care. Elimination of the marriage tax penalty would give the same couple the choice of paying for three months of child care—or addressing other family priorities. After all, parents know better than Washington what their family needs.

We fondly remember the 1996 State of the Union address when the President declared emphatically that, quote “the era of big government is over.”

We must stick to our guns, and stay the course.

There never was an American appetite for big government.

But there certainly is for reforming the existing way government does business.

And what better way to show the American people that our government will continue along

the path to reform and prosperity than by eliminating the marriage tax penalty.

Ladies and Gentleman, we are on the verge of running a surplus. It's basic math.

It means Americans are already paying more than is needed for government to do the job we expect of it.

What better way to give back than to begin with mom and dad and the American family—the backbone of our society.

We ask that President Clinton join with Congress and make elimination of the marriage tax penalty a bipartisan priority.

Of all the challenges married couples face in providing home and hearth to America's children, the U.S. tax code should not be one of them.

Let's eliminate The Marriage Tax Penalty and do it now.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD a copy of a newspaper article dealing with the Tax Code and handling the budget surplus.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Jan. 31, 1999]

HOW TO HANDLE THE BUDGET SURPLUS

WASHINGTON.—Four years ago when I was first elected to Congress, I ran on the need for fiscal restraint in Washington, D.C., and a return of power to people back home. We fought for our belief that we could balance the budget and provide a tax relief for America's working families. For months we were told by Washington insiders and the media that it couldn't be done. Well, we proved them wrong, and we did it ahead of schedule.

Today Congress has a great opportunity as well as a significant challenge before it. A massive surplus of extra tax revenue is projected as a result of a balanced budget. The challenge lies in what Congress chooses to do with the budget surplus.

Saving Social Security is the first priority for the surplus. It's a bipartisan consensus. Last fall, House Republicans showed tremendous responsibility and leadership by passing a plan that earmarked 90 percent of the surplus for Social Security. President Clinton used this month's State of the Union message to call for setting aside a minimum of 62 percent of the surplus (\$2.7 trillion over 15 years) for Social Security.

Although we were prepared to set aside much more to save Social Security, Republicans agree to the president's request to set aside 62 percent of the surplus for Social Security. But the question remains of what to do with the rest. President Clinton proposes to spend it on big, new, expensive programs; Republicans want to give this back as tax relief.

Those who oppose tax cuts will fight tooth and nail against lowering today's tax burden. According to the U.S. Treasury, the total income tax take from individuals and families has increased 63 percent since 1992. In fact, according to the Tax Foundation, if you add up the local, state and federal tax burden, taxes are almost 40 percent of the average family's income. Wouldn't most people agree that today's tax burden is too high?

We can save Social Security and cut taxes at the same time. Some say we can't—they were the same ones who opposed balancing the budget and cutting taxes. We proved them wrong. For example, using only 25 percent of the surplus (allowing for an additional 13 percent of the surplus to be dedicated to shoring up Social Security or paying down the national debt) we could enact a 10 percent across-the-board tax cut for all American taxpayers while still eliminating the unfair marriage tax penalty and relieving family farms and family businesses of the inheritance or "death" tax.

The president's step gives us a window of opportunity to save Social Security. We commend the president for his new-found willingness to work with us to save Social Security, secure retirement savings, provide sorely needed tax relief and equip the next generation to compete in a global economy. But now that we have agreed on the first step in saving Social Security, we need to focus on the details. It is irresponsible to spend the people's surplus on new, big government programs. We must give this money back to the American people. Saving Social Security, paying down our national debt and offering real and substantial tax relief to all working Americans are three strong ways to spur our economy and lead the way into the next century.

—U.S. Rep. Jerry Weller (R-Ill.).

2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, a previous Speaker talked about his concerns that the Medicare Commission is going to be unsuccessful today, and that is very unfortunate. I think that Senator BREAU, a Democrat from Louisiana, and Senator KERREY, a Democrat from Nebraska, and other Members are advocating a way to save the Medicare program for the future. Ten of the 16 Members, according to the newspaper, will support a Premium Support plan, which is a way to really modernize Medicare and bring it into the 21st century. It is disappointing that they are not going to be able to get this supermajority, but we need to continue to try, because Medicare is too important a program to let fail as it is moving towards bankruptcy.

But, Madam Speaker, today I rise to talk about the upcoming 2000 Census. One year from this month the forms will go in the mail and we will begin the process of counting everyone in this great country. After wasting millions of dollars, the Census Bureau had planned for an illegal census plan to use sampling. The Supreme Court ruled this past January that they cannot use this illegal plan to only count 90 percent of the population.

Thank goodness the Supreme Court ruled when it did, because now we will at least have an actual count of the population. But sadly, the Census Bureau is going to advocate a two-number census. They are going to advocate a number, as approved by the Supreme Court, where they will count everyone, and then they want to adjust those numbers and have a second set of Clinton numbers. So we will have the Supreme Court approved numbers of actual counts and then the adjusted or manipulated numbers of the Clinton administration.

Wow, what a disaster we are going to face with this census. And the census, I think we could call it, the DNA of our democracy, because most elected officials in America are dependent on this

census for drawing their lines to represent, whether it is a school board, a State legislator or a city council person. Billions of dollars are allocated by this money, based on the census.

A two-number census is bad for several reasons. First of all, it is terrible public policy; second of all, it is illegal; and, third, it is less accurate. As far as public policy, the Census Bureau has argued for years that we should only have a one-number census, and now they have flip-flopped. Due to political pressure they have flip-flopped to go to a two-number census. It will add confusion and create a lack of trust in this system.

Imagine that. I am from Bradenton, Florida. My city will have two numbers. Not just the city, every census block in the city; every census track in the city. A block may have 20 or 50 people. There will be two numbers, one by the Supreme Court approval and one that Clinton says, these are my numbers, use these. Talk about confusion. The Census Bureau was right, until they flip-flopped, and now political pressure has caused them to change.

Well, I expect the Supreme Court will rule that the second set of numbers will be illegal anyway. Reading the ruling by Supreme Court Justice O'Connor in the majority opinion in January, talking about the issues of one man, one vote issues, talking about the technical statistical issues of taking a census track where we may have 20, 40, or 50 people living and then adjusting it, it is going to be torn apart in the courts and thrown out. So, again, they are proceeding down an illegal route.

And then the statistics. I used to teach statistics for many years, and I have a lot of confidence in sampling. The problem is, when we start using statistics and sampling and adjustment for redistricting, we have to work with census block data. There are millions of census blocks in this country, and when we start drawing lines based on a block, whether it is a city block or whatever the dimensions are in an individual's area, and then those are adjusted, the accuracy is not very accurate.

When they analyzed the attempt to do this back in 1990, they said it was less accurate, and yet that is what they are advocating, and that is what is so disappointing. Well, the Republicans in Congress have been advocating some improvements to the 2000 Census plan, and I am puzzled why Democrats would oppose ideas to improve the plan. It is just puzzling why they do not want to improve it.

□ 1000

For example, one proposal made is the Census Bureau is only going to publish the forms in five languages. They say that accounts for 99 percent of the people. There are a lot of different languages out there representing a lot of other people living in this country that are going to have a hard time completing the form.

We had a hearing in Miami. There are over 100,000 Haitians living in the Dade County area in Miami. They do not publish the form in Creole. So how are you going to count this undercounted area? How do you tell these people, "Tough, you cannot get counted, or else if you call in we will find a translator for you?"

What is wrong in publishing the form in Creole? They will publish the instructions in Creole, but they refuse to publish the seven-question short form in Creole. And that is true of all the other languages. They do not even do it for Braille. If you cannot see, what do you have to do? You have to call the Census Bureau and discuss it with someone on the telephone. Why will they not listen to some ideas to improve it?

Another one that local officials should support is to give them a chance to check the numbers before they become final. They did it in 1990. It is not a new idea. But they are afraid for people to check their work. They make mistakes. We all make mistakes. Why not allow local officials, mayors, city managers, county commissioners, what have you, to check the numbers before they become official?

Conducting the census is hard work, and we need to concentrate our efforts into doing the best census possible to eliminate the undercount and get everyone counted.

YOUNG PEOPLE WORKING FOR LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 19, 1999, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, an important part of what makes livable communities is a broad concept of what constitutes the infrastructure that constructs them. That means both the natural environment as well as the built environment. And most important, it also means our people.

Today I would like to focus for a moment on one of the most important parts of the human infrastructure in a livable community, our young people. They are a key part in our community in Portland, Oregon, not just young people at work learning to prepare for their future careers but making real accomplishments as they go.

This week in Washington, D.C., one of my constituents, Jennifer Fletcher, from Grant High School, is being honored by Seventeen Magazine for her volunteerism. Jennifer is one of those extraordinary young people, although only 16 years of age, who has focused in on things that will make a difference in her community. I think in part inspired by a movie that was shot at her high school, "Mr. Holland's Opus," a Richard Dreyfus story about how a music teacher was able to inspire a community to make investments for its future.

Jennifer has done something that would make any screen writer proud. She has founded "Arts Alive" in our community in response to funding cuts for arts programs at their schools. "Arts Alive" is dedicated to providing funding for these schools, and she has exhibited extraordinary creativity in how to go about it.

Her most recent accomplishment was to stage a benefit concert. She approached her favorite singer, Jackson Browne, to help her in the cause. She handled all the details from ticket sales, to securing a Portland concert hall, to arranging transportation and hotel accommodations for the band. And as a result of her dedication and marvelous skills, the concert was a huge success, bringing together people in the community to celebrate the arts, to be a part of a larger effort, and, by the way, raising almost \$100,000.

I am proud of the difference that Ms. Fletcher has made. I applaud her future efforts. But they are just the tip of the iceberg in our community. As I look at the Oregon Youth Conservation Corps, which has put young people to work improving the environment, hiring at-risk high school young people, giving them school credit for their work but giving them real-life activities where they were shoulder to shoulder with professionals in creating recreation trails, viewing areas, restoring watershed, preventing soil erosion, promoting recycling, and participating in wetland restoration projects, real work for real kids, learning kids, earning while they went.

In David Douglas High School, I have seen young people solve very creatively a transportation problem between two of their buildings by creating their own light rail line, converting two buses, laying the track, all with volunteers and donated labor.

The Northwest Service Academy, with 150 AmeriCorps volunteers, working with over 10,000 people in the community, dealing with issues of storm water runoff, roof drain disconnect, converting hundreds of homes to different approaches to solve this problem much more cheaply than if we were just building concrete underground cisterns.

The goal of a livable community through smart growth and careful planning is to get more out of our scarce dollars, our land, and our people. By harnessing the creative power of our youth, putting them to work through education, employment, and environmental activities is one of the most creative ways that we can truly make America's communities livable.

And for all our talk about smart growth and transportation initiatives and protecting the environment, I hope that we will continue to focus on ways to harness our young people to be full partners in making our communities livable.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 11 a.m.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 6 minutes a.m.) the House stood in recess until 11 a.m.

□ 1100

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LINDER) at 11 a.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Rev. James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O gracious God, from whom all blessings flow, we remember in our prayer all those who turn to You with their petitions and their needs. Where there is hunger, grant nourishment; where there is sadness, grant a full measure of joy and gladness; where there is uncertainty or anxiety about the future, grant Your peace that passes all human understanding. May Your good spirit, O God, that is with us in all the moments of life grant peace and pardon and hope to us and to all Your people now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KLECZKA led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 540. An act to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to prohibit transfers or discharges of residents of nursing facilities as a result of a voluntary withdrawal from participation in the Medicaid Program.

The message also announced, That pursuant to section 201(a)(2) of Public Law 93-344, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, announces the joint appointment of Mr. Dan Crippen as Director of the Congressional Budget Office,

effective February 3, 1999, for a term expiring on January 3, 2003.

LET US GET TO THE BOTTOM OF THE TRANSFER OF TECHNOLOGY TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

(Mr. HAYWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in the wake of shocking revelations of Chinese espionage, and the unlawful and unauthorized transfer of nuclear technology from our Nation to the People's Republic of China and the curious coincidence that the Clinton-Gore campaign took Chinese money in the 1996 presidential campaign, let me propose four immediate steps that this House should take.

Number 1, Mr. Speaker, let me call on the President. If he wants to get to the bottom of this scandal, as his spinners suggest, this President should release forthwith the report of this House's select committee headed by the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) into the entire episode.

Number 2, I should point out, Mr. Speaker, 60 colleagues have joined me in signing a letter to the chairman of our Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS), urging him to conduct his own hearings since the Cox committee will soon lapse.

Number 3, I would call on this Congress to close our national laboratories to these so-called cultural exchanges because what they are are pilfering—our technology.

And Number 4, Mr. Speaker, Sandy Berger must go.

CHINA WILL STOP AT NOTHING

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, in 1992 a Russian spy who defected to America said China is determined to destroy America from within. He further said, and I quote, China would buy or steal our industrial and military secrets. He said China would buy American politicians. And the Russian spy further said, and I quote, China will stop at nothing. In spite of all this, China got for free our missile technology, China got naval bases, and China gets and continues to get a sweetheart trade deal financing the next major threat to our sovereignty.

Beam me up. Someone in high places in America is in bed with the Chinese Red Army and the Chinese Communists.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back a \$50-billion-plus trade deficit that threatens our future.

CELEBRATING THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF SCOTLAND COUNTY, NORTH CAROLINA

(Mr. HAYES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and pleasure to rise today to pay special tribute to Scotland County, North Carolina, as it celebrates in 1999 its 100th anniversary. I also want to recognize this Thursday, March 18, as Agricultural Appreciation Day in Scotland County.

Although Scotland County is relatively young among North Carolina counties, having been created by the North Carolina General Assembly on February 20, 1899, it has a rich and interesting history. Central in the history of Scotland County is the presence of and dependence on agriculture. Agriculture in Scotland County, just like in the rest of America, is recognized as the foundation of our society.

Scotland County Farmers contribute over 40 million dollars to the local economy. There are approximately 125 farms in Scotland County which produce cotton, soybeans, corn, wheat, tobacco, oats and hay; hogs and broilers are also raised in Scotland County.

Scotland County farmers contribute over \$40 million to the local economy. There are approximately 125 farms in Scotland County which produce cotton, soybeans, corn, wheat, tobacco, oats, hay and hogs. Broilers are also raised in Scotland County.

Mr. Speaker, Scotland County farmers are the stewards of the soil and water resources that provide substance to feed, clothe and shelter the American people and those around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with others in Scotland County to honor those individuals involved in agriculture, one of the most noble of professions, and thank each farmer in Scotland County, indeed each farmer in America, for their hard work and commitment to stewardship of the land and providing food and clothing to the world.

KEEPING OUR PROMISE TO VETERANS

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Republican solution to add \$1.9 billion to the administration's proposal to save and improve the health care of our Nation's veterans.

Mr. Speaker, few things are more sacred and solemn than the promises we have made to our Nation's veterans because we would not enjoy the peace, the prosperity and the freedoms we have today without their sacrifices. Unfortunately, though, that promise does not mean much to some because they would like to pass a budget that literally is a slap in the face to every veteran we have.

Mr. Speaker, 10 years ago we elevated the VA to a Cabinet level department

for a very good reason. We wanted the VA to have the President's ear. But is the President listening?

We need to protect the future of VA health care, we need to protect the future of our veterans. Unfortunately, however, the administration's proposed budget fails to do this.

I encourage all Members to support our Nation's veterans, back the Committee on Veterans' Affairs' budget recommendation and keep the promises we have made to those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice to this country.

REPUBLICANS TAKING THE LEAD IN MAKING SURE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE WILL BE THERE WHEN PEOPLE NEED IT

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, to make sure that the Social Security and Medicare are there when people need it, the Republican plan locks away 100 percent of the retirement surplus in a safe deposit box.

Now I know that the response of many seniors in my district is, "But I thought that was already the case," or, "Why wasn't that done a long time ago?"

Mr. Speaker, I cannot answer for 40 years of Democrat control of this body, but I can say that Republicans are taking the lead on the issue. While the President's plan takes only 62 percent of the surplus and reserves it for Social Security, the Republican plan takes 100 percent of the retirement surplus and locks it away for both Social Security and Medicare.

Now let me repeat that the Republican plan locks away 100 percent of the retirement surplus and reserves it for Social Security and Medicare. Let us not kid ourselves. The retirement surplus alone will not solve the problems of Social Security and Medicare, but our commitment to strengthen these two programs and protect seniors is clear.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Democrat colleagues to join us in a commitment to protecting these programs for seniors.

PUT THE TRUST BACK INTO THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

(Mrs. KELLY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, this week we know two things we did not know last week. First, Republicans are setting aside more money for Social Security than the President is in his budget. Second thing we know is that the President's budget numbers do not add up. In fact, the numbers are so wrong that no one is defending them. The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, or CBO, found that they have not

seen such double counting since the White House wacky plan to use sampling and educated guesses for the census.

Mr. Speaker, the President's spending numbers are pure fiction. His Social Security numbers are even worse. How does one take seriously a plan that double counts to the tune of \$2.4 trillion? Even Newsweek and the Washington Post are having a good laugh about that.

Unfortunately, the retirement security of seniors should not be subject to phony numbers and accounting gimmicks that even Orange County, California could not get away with.

Let us put the trust back in the Social Security Trust Fund.

ALL AMERICANS WILL GET TO SEE THEIR STATE OR TERRITORY ON THE BACK OF A QUARTER THANKS TO THE GENTLEMAN FROM ALABAMA (MR. BACHUS)

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, congratulations to Delaware, the first State whose design appears on the back of a quarter. This follows a bill we passed last year allowing this privilege to every State, privileges to deficit reduction. Every State gets a turn at its own design except the District of Columbia and the four territories who were somehow left out.

We are American citizens every bit as much as the residents of the 50 States thanks to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS), who has cosponsored a bill to allow the District of Columbia and the territories to be added. All American citizens will get to see their State, their territory or their District of Columbia design on the back of a quarter.

Mr. Speaker, we welcome the help of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) and ask that this bill come to the floor soon so that we can cure this oversight.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 15, 1999.

Hon. J. DENNIS HASTERT,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of Rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives. I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on March 15, 1999 at 4:44 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAH.

CONTINUING NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO IRAN—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-40)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), and section 505(c) of the International Security and Development Cooperation Act of 1985, 22 U.S.C. 2349aa-9(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Iran that was declared in Executive Order 12957 of March 15, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, March 15, 1999.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken later today.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 774) to amend the Small Business Act to change the conditions of participation and provide an authorization of appropriations for the women's business center program, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 774

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 29(c)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(c)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A) by inserting "and" after the semicolon at the end; and

(2) by striking subparagraphs (B) and (C) and inserting the following:

"(B) in the third, fourth, and fifth years, 1 non-Federal dollar for each Federal dollar."

(b) APPLICABILITY.—The amendments made by this section shall apply beginning October 1, 1998.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 29(k)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 656(k)(1)) is amended by striking "8,000,000" and inserting "11,000,000".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentleman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today the House considers H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999. As a member of the Committee on Small Business, I know how important this bill is to Members on both sides of the aisle and to some small business women throughout the Nation. The committee held a hearing in early February and thoroughly examined this program before drafting the legislation. The committee marked up H.R. 774 and unanimously passed it on February 25.

Before I take a moment to explain the bill, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, my colleague from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) as well as the rest of my friends from the Democratic side of the aisle for their commitment to this issue and their help in moving this legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, March is Women's History Month. Throughout March we honor women who have dedicated their lives to improving the position of women society, and we celebrate the achievements of women throughout history. While this month we celebrate the accomplishments of the past, today we have the opportunity to promote the success of thousands of women in the future. The ability of women-owned businesses to flourish is crucial to our Nation's economic future.

Consider some of the following statistics. Women entrepreneurs are starting two-thirds of all small businesses in this country. Women-owned businesses are growing at twice the rate of all other businesses. Women own nearly 40 percent of all businesses in the United States of America.

I have been a small business owner, and I know both the joy and heartbreak that comes from owning a business. Additionally, as chair of the Congressional Women's Caucus, I have heard much from women who want to succeed in the business world. They will do so if given a chance. Consequently, this Congress has a responsibility to do all we can to support the growing economic force of women business owners.

One way in which we can do this is to support the Women's Business Center Program at the U.S. Small Business Administration. Women's business centers play a major role in empowering women entrepreneurs with the tools necessary to succeed in business. Right

now there are more than 60 women's business centers operating in almost 40 States.

□ 1115

Whether it is targeting low income women, assisting women to focus their business plans through courses on workshops, or providing information on access to capital, these centers tailor their services to the communities they serve.

The bottom line is that women's business centers contribute to the success of thousands of women entrepreneurs by enhancing their management capacity and capability and offering the critical community infrastructure necessary for them to succeed in today's business climate.

The women's business center program is funded through the Small Business Administration. It began as a demonstration program in 1988. In 1993, the program received only \$1.5 million per year. By 1997, Congress recognized the program's growth and success and made the program permanent. It also increased the program's authorization level to \$8 million per year.

In the 106th Congress, the committee has continued its interest and oversight in the program. As part of this process, it became clear that while the program was expanding to States that do not currently have centers, existing centers were experiencing obstacles to their own growth. We also found that the existing authorization level did not adequately meet the needs of the program.

H.R. 774 addresses both of these concerns. First, H.R. 774 changes the funding ratio in the fifth year of funding to ease the fund-raising burden on centers entering their final year of Federal funding. In the past, federally funded centers had to raise two non-Federal dollars to obtain one Federal dollar in their fifth and final year of funding.

Some sites, particularly those located in rural areas, have limited access to foundations, corporations and banks that provide the private funds used to match the Federal funds. H.R. 774 eases this fund-raising burden by changing the ratio of funding to one non-Federal dollar for every one Federal dollar.

Second, H.R. 774 increases the authorization of appropriations to \$11 million in order to support expansion of the program in fiscal year 2000. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, H.R. 774 is not controversial legislation. The bill was passed by the Committee on Small Business unanimously.

I would like to thank the chairman, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) for his efforts on this legislation. I would also like to again thank the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the entire Committee on Small Business for their bipartisan work on this legislation. I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 774.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999, legislation that I introduced in committee with the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY), the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. SCHAKOWSKY), the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. MC CHRISTENSEN), the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA). It is fitting that this bill, which will help America's women entrepreneurs succeed, is before the House during Women's History Month.

I thank the Members of the Committee on Small Business for their support of this bill. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the chairman of the Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), for all of his hard work on this legislation and for being such a strong supporter of the women's business center program.

My colleagues, the face of American business is changing. Over the past 2 decades, we have seen phenomenal growth in the number of women-owned businesses. In 1976, women owned just 6 percent of this country's businesses. Today, that number has grown to over 35 percent. That is over 8 million businesses nationwide. By the year 2000, it is expected that one out of every two businesses will be owned by a woman. That is a remarkable transformation and one which will help more Americans achieve the American dream.

In order to help women achieve this goal, however, we must provide them with the skills necessary to compete in the global economy of the 21st century. This is why the women's business center program is so important. These centers provide a broad range of services, including training and counseling, to women in the area of finance, management and marketing. Currently, the program serves an average of 2,000 women in 36 states and results in economic development, new jobs, increased earning potential and a larger pool of skilled entrepreneurs. Thanks to this program, countless women entrepreneurs have opened or expanded their own business.

The women's business center program becomes even more important when you realize its potential for helping women move from welfare to work. Women on public assistance often want to start their own business but lack the training and support necessary to accomplish this goal. Women's business centers show them how to turn their skills and knowledge into a viable business. By providing business counseling and technical assistance, women's cen-

ters are helping women entrepreneurs break the cycle of poverty and become economically self-sufficient. This is one of the many remarkable stories of this program.

Today's legislation, H.R. 774, does two important things to help the women's business center program. First, it increases the authorization level to \$11 million for fiscal year 2000. This increase of \$3 million over the previous authorization level will ensure the continued growth of this initiative. One of the original goals of this program was to give women in all 50 states access to the business training and programs that they need to become their own boss. By providing an additional \$3 million, not only will we be helping existing centers but we can open new facilities in currently underserved areas. That means that more women will be able to work toward the goal of self-employment.

The second part of this legislation reduces the requirement in the fifth year of funding. Currently, women's business centers are required to raise two non-Federal dollars for every Federal dollar they receive. In some cases, centers have been forced to cut back on valuable services because they have not been able to raise the money needed to drawdown the full amount. Reducing the fifth year match to a one-to-one ratio, one Federal dollar for every one non-Federal dollar, will allow these valuable entrepreneurial training services to continue without interruption. This is a step that will benefit everyone.

The legislation before us today represents an important investment in the future of our country. As more and more women decide to become their own boss these centers will provide them with the resources and training they need to achieve this goal. No one can deny that women have come a long way in this country, but more needs to be done. With women entrepreneurs playing a critical role in the economic health of our Nation, we must make sure that they have access to the tools they need for success. The public-private partnership of the women's business center program helps meet this critical need and today's legislation represents an important step in making sure that we continue to move forward with this program and empowering our Nation's women. I strongly support this legislation and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. BONO).

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999. As a business woman, I share a kindred spirit with the entrepreneurial females of today. Anyone, be it a man or a woman, who strikes it on their own takes a certain amount of risk.

Not only can you lose your investment if your business does not succeed but also your pride and spirit. So it is comforting to know that there is a resource for women to turn to when they choose to start or expand their business.

With women owning nearly 40 percent of all firms in the United States, it is obvious we have come a long way towards achieving equity in the business world. Through programs such as the women's business centers and the hard work of the business women themselves, maybe government assistance will not even be necessary in the near future. Congress can play a vital role in helping women help themselves and achieve this goal of self sufficiency. Currently, women's business centers must raise two non-Federal dollars to obtain one Federal dollar in their fifth and final year of funding. By changing the ratio to one Federal dollar for one non-Federal dollar, we can help these centers achieve an even higher level of success.

While we must continue to reassess this program and how it is best administered, I am confident that at this point the women's business centers need and deserve our support.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to pass this important piece of legislation.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY).

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, the good news in our economy today is the booming sector of women-owned businesses. We are seeing a dramatic increase. Let me give you a couple of numbers from the State of Illinois, my State.

As of 1996, there were nearly 337,000 women-owned businesses in Illinois employing nearly 950,000, almost a million people, and generating \$119.8 billion in sales.

During the period of 1987 and 1996, the National Federation of Women-Owned Businesses estimates that the number of women-owned firms in Illinois has increased by 75 percent, and that employment has grown by 201 percent and sales have risen 252 percent, a pretty good record.

In Chicago, we have the Women's Business Development Center, an organization that I have worked with for many years and watched the kind of nurturing they do of women-owned businesses. They provide counseling, entrepreneurial training, financial assistance, loan packaging, certification of women business enterprises, procurement assistance at the State and local and Federal levels and they also do advocacy on women's economic empowerment.

The majority of the clients of the Women's Business Development Center are low income women. Fifty-three percent are women of color and much of their work helps women with self-employment and microenterprise de-

velopment, and they also provide assistance to women who have formerly been on welfare. So we are saying that they are providing women the ladder of economic opportunity.

In my own town, I have an example of a business that was assisted by the Women's Business Development Center. It is not really a very dramatic story but it is the kind of work that they do every single day. A woman named Victoria Fonseca came to the Women's Business Development Center in November of 1997 with a desire to open an establishment that is a wine bar, a bistro and a wine retail store. She had some experience in the business but had not worked for herself at all, had not established her own enterprise.

She went to the Women's Business Development Center, who assisted her in developing a business plan and the development of realistic projections. The women's business development center packaged the loan for the Small Business Administration women's pre-qualification loan program, and they got that. There were many bumps along the road in finding a location, in finding a bank that would accept it, and all the way the Women's Business Development Center was holding her hand and leading her through the process.

Finally, a location was found in downtown Evanston and it required redoing the projections to ensure that the original loan amount was sufficient.

Finally, last month the Sustained Glass, an enterprise in Evanston, was opened up and opened for business and, again, is just one example of the many businesses that have been assisted by the Women's Business Development Center.

□ 1130

So I would encourage support of this bill, the increase in funding, the increase in ability to access these dollars, so that we can see more good news for our economic sector, and business development.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendments Act.

As we stand at the dawn of the 21st century and think about the future, this bill embodies the potential that the next millennium holds for all of us. It is a bill that will help women continue to realize their full potential and take a bold step into the future, and now is the time to act.

As our economy continues to bloom, the need for more and more skilled businesswomen and entrepreneurs becomes of paramount importance. Women's business centers are vital in assuring that all segments of our economy are able to take advantage of the current time of prosperity.

By providing women entrepreneurs with the training they need to move to economic independence, we help communities throughout our country grow. In my district in North Brooklyn, many women entrepreneurs and small businesses are poised to start or expand their businesses. All they need is access to some of the technical information and training services that are available through SBA. Today, by expanding the women's business centers, we will take a step toward unlocking that untapped potential in neighborhoods throughout the country.

The type of work done by women's business centers is a catalyst for success. Women's business centers take the promise of potential and turn it into the reality of results, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure. It is an initiative that will have a lasting positive impact for the economic strength of our communities, both now and in the future.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my support for the Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999. This important piece of legislation will continue to help women business owners obtain the necessary tools needed to succeed in the competitive business environment.

Women business owners have historically been under-served, or even excluded, from past legislation aimed at assisting small businesses. This is unfortunate because women are starting businesses at twice the rate of all businesses. They employ over 23 million people within the United States and contribute well over \$3 trillion to the economy. Yet they still encounter obstacles when trying to foster their growth.

The Women's Business Center Amendments Act of 1999 directly addresses this concern by providing the technical assistance, and training needed to gain access to credit and capital needed to launch a new business. Since 1988 these centers have proven their usefulness by tailoring their services to the particular needs of the community. Even today, they continue to find more effective ways to serve aspiring women entrepreneurs, from inner cities to rural areas across the country.

Given the proven success of this program, and the positive impact it has on surrounding communities, I fully support the need to increase funding for this program, along with changing the fifth year matching requirement for federal support. The SBA has stated that it is their goal to have a Women's Business Center in every state. Voting in support of this legislation will greatly enhance the chances of this becoming a reality.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendment Act. This valuable program provides women entrepreneurs with assistance in running their business, receiving access to capital and other support they need to succeed.

The number of women business owners is increasing—by the year 2000 it is expected that one out of every two businesses will be owned by a woman. As women continue to open businesses at twice the rate of men, those numbers are only expected to grow. It is vital that we strengthen this program to help

create opportunities for women across the country and ensure they can take advantage of them.

H.R. 774 improves the Small Business Administration's Women's Business Center Program by increasing the authorization for funding by \$3 million for Fiscal Year 2000, and reducing the amount of private funding that centers are required to have in their fifth and final year of operation. These two changes will strengthen this valuable program by providing additional funds so more Women's Business Centers can be opened and existing centers can continue to offer a variety of services in their fifth year.

This legislation will benefit the nineteenth district of Illinois by helping rural women business owners and promoting economic development, and urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this important measure.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in strong support of H.R. 774, the Women's Business Center Amendments Act.

In addition to reauthorizing this important program, this bill will increase funding for the Small Business Administration's Women's Business Center program by \$3 million. I strongly support the vision of this program as well as the increase in funding levels.

Providing assistance and services to women considering entrepreneurial endeavors is vital to the success of the economy of the 22nd District of Columbia and our entire nation. On the Central Coast, 80% of all business activity is generated by small business, and many of these businesses are run by women. Assisting small businesses, and ensuring that the doors of economic opportunity are open to all women, are priorities for me in Congress.

Currently, there are only 60 Women's Business Centers in 36 states, but many more are needed. At this time, women in my congressional district must travel over 100 miles to reach a center, and for many this distance precludes them from availing themselves of those resources. By increasing the funding for this program, we will be able to reach out to the many women that are now underserved on the Central Coast and throughout the nation.

Women's Business Centers assists women entrepreneurs at all levels of business development by teaching the principles of finance, management and marketing. The program has demonstrated particular success with low-income, single and minority women.

The assistance provided at Women's Business Centers enables women to fight poverty by giving them the tools to become self-sufficient, successful business owners who are leaders in their communities.

I strongly urge my colleagues to pass this bill and support the Women's Business Center program.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support H.R. 774, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 774, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 774, the bill just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT EMPLOYEES WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 858) to amend title 11, District of Columbia Code, to extend coverage under the whistleblower protection provisions of the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to personnel of the courts of the District of Columbia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 858

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "District of Columbia Court Employees Whistleblower Protection Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION FOR PERSONNEL OF THE COURTS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

"§ 11-1733. Whistleblower protection for court personnel

"Notwithstanding any other provision of law, section 1503 of the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 (DC Code, sec. 1-616.3) shall apply to court personnel, except that court personnel may institute a civil action pursuant to subsection (c) of such section in the Superior Court of the District of Columbia or the United States District Court for the District of Columbia."

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for subchapter II of chapter 17 of title 11, District of Columbia Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

"11-1733. Whistleblower protection for court personnel."

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 2 shall take effect as if included in the enactment of title XI of the Balanced Budget Act of 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS).

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 858 is a straightforward, bipartisan bill. It simply levels the playing field by providing employees of the D.C. Superior Court, many of whom are my constituents, the same whistleblower protections that are enjoyed by other city employees under the District's Merit Personnel Act. It is also in accordance with the protections which cover employees in the Federal court system. The only additional option we are providing for any claimants, for obvious reasons, is the possibility of seeking relief in either the local or the Federal courts.

The reason we need this bill, and we need to pass it in an expeditious fashion, is because of an ongoing GAO study of the financial and budgetary practices of the District of Columbia courts. At my request, management practices are being included in the GAO study.

On January 26, 1999, I joined with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations, and the ranking member of that subcommittee, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), in encouraging the Superior Court to urge employees who may have information useful to the GAO auditors to step forward without fear of retaliation. These assurances were provided in the form of administrative orders. We are grateful for such assurances. The bill is intended to provide statutory guarantees that can back up the court's order. It also plugs a loophole in the law that would help to ensure that Congress and others will continue to get the most candid and accurate information.

It is obviously very important that when Congress asks for a GAO study, that GAO auditors be in a position to get the answers that they seek. Otherwise, Congress could be basing its subsequent oversight and legislation on misleading data. H.R. 858 would help to guarantee the integrity of the information Congress will be receiving.

The D.C. Superior Court has over 1,000 employees and an annual budget of over \$128 million. Whistleblower protection is by now a time-honored method of uncovering waste, fraud, abuse and mismanagement. It should also be noted that Title XI of the D.C. Code, which this bill amends, is the sole prerogative of Congress to change under the Home Rule Act.

I would emphasize that this legislation should not be misconstrued to cast any aspersions on those responsible for the sound management of the D.C. Superior Court. We are merely backing up the Court's own directives by providing routine protections which are overdue and which could help the GAO and Congress to receive the most accurate information.

The Congressional Budget Office has assured us that this bill will not affect direct spending or receipts, and I want to urge passage of H.R. 858.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of cosponsors to this bill, and I want to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for moving this through the Committee on Government Reform so expeditiously and my colleague, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her help in the drafting of this.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for bringing the District of Columbia Court Employees Whistleblower Protection Act of 1999 to the House floor today. May I also thank the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK), the chairman of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Appropriations and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the ranking member, for their work on the problems underlying this bill. I am an original cosponsor of this noncontroversial legislation, and I am pleased to have been so.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 858 amends Title XI of the District of Columbia Code to provide a new section affording whistleblower protections to D.C. court personnel. Congressional action is required because the District's Home Rule Charter allows only the Congress to amend Title XI, which relates to the Federal judiciary. As well, the Federal assumption of D.C. court costs in the District of Columbia Revitalization and Self-Government Improvement Act of 1997, known as the Revitalization Act, leaves Congress as the body with principal oversight over the D.C. courts.

May I say that we remain very pleased and gratified that through action of the Congress, the Federal Government has taken over certain State functions that no city could carry today.

While this bill addresses an important issue, I want to indicate that there are other concerns as well that are similar, and perhaps other inevitable gaps in the law affecting the public safety elements of the Revitalization Act that were transferred because, after all, we were dealing with a very large transfer in that act.

I appreciate that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) has agreed that the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia of the Committee on Government Reform will hold hearings in the spring on the other outstanding issues, especially those affecting the courts and halfway houses. Meanwhile, I agree that whistleblower protection is needed now in order to allow the GAO to proceed on an investigation of certain aspects of the D.C. court system.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 858 would grant D.C. court personnel the same whistleblower protections currently enjoyed

by other D.C. employees under the District's Merit Personnel Act. An employee who discloses what she reasonably believes to be a violation of law, misuse of government resources or funds, should always be protected. In addition, H.R. 858 would allow court employees to bring a civil action in either D.C. Superior Court or the United States Court for violation of whistleblower protections. District court jurisdiction is appropriate, considering that it is the Superior Court that might be the subject of litigation, and also because of the jurisdiction of the Federal Government over the district courts under the Revitalization Act.

Mr. Speaker, let me emphasize that I have full confidence in Superior Court Chief Judge Eugene Hamilton who has indicated, and I am quoting him, that "There has not been, nor will there be, any retaliation or any other adverse consequences to any employee as a result of cooperating with the audit." Judge Hamilton has issued his own order to this effect.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 858, applying the same whistleblower protection to court employees that other D.C. employees now rely upon, should bolster Judge Hamilton's orders to court management to fully comply with the GAO requests. I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the Congressional Budget Office cost estimate and the statement of administration policy, the support from the administration.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

(This statement has been coordinated by OMB with the concerned agencies.)

H.R. 858—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT EMPLOYEES WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

(Rep. Davis (R) VA and 3 cosponsors)

The Administration supports H.R. 858, which would extend coverage under the whistleblower protection provisions of the District of Columbia Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act of 1978 to personnel of the courts of the District of Columbia. The change would protect these employees from losing their jobs or otherwise being penalized for disclosing violations of the law or misuse of government funds or resources. Similar protection is already provided to most District employees.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE—MARCH 15, 1999

H.R. 858—DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COURT EMPLOYEES' WHISTLEBLOWER PROTECTION ACT OF 1999—AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM ON MARCH 10, 1999

H.R. 858 would amend District of Columbia statutes to extend protection from retaliatory action to court personnel who disclose seemingly unlawful or fraudulent practices. Protection would also extend to D.C. court personnel who participate in an investigation into alleged violations of law or refuse to participate in activities that are fraudulent or unlawful. Under the bill, court employees could seek relief from violations by filing civil claims in either the Superior

Court of the District of Columbia or the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia. CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 858 would have little or no effect on the federal budget. The bill would not affect direct spending or receipts; therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

H.R. 858 contains an intergovernmental mandate as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA) because it would impose enforceable duties on the District of Columbia with regard to the treatment of court personnel. CBO estimates that the costs of complying with this mandate would be minimal. H.R. 858 contains no private-sector mandates as defined in UMRA.

The CBO staff contacts are John R. Righter (for federal costs), who can be reached at 226-2860, and Susan Sieg (for the state and local impact), who can be reached at 225-3220. This estimate was approved by Robert A. Sunshine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to add my voice in support of H.R. 858, the District of Columbia Whistleblower Act. I commend Committee Chairman DAN BURTON and D.C. Subcommittee Chairman TOM DAVIS for bringing this legislation to the House floor in a timely manner.

H.R. 858 merely extends the same whistleblower protections to employees of the D.C. Superior Court that federal employees and District of Columbia workers enjoy. The bill also gives D.C. Superior Court employees the option of taking complaints of wrongdoing to the local or to the federal courts.

It is my understanding that the General Accounting Office (GAO) is conducting a study of the financial operations and the management practices of the D.C. courts. This legislation will give D.C. Superior Court workers the confidence and security they need to step forward with information that may be helpful to the GAO.

Whenever waste, fraud, and abuse occur within a federal agency or within a federal or local court, there are employees who know about it and are angered by it. These employees need to know that they will not suffer damage to their careers if they uncover and try to correct these abuses. Pentagon employees who report millions of dollars of wasteful spending and lawyers at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission who question the safety of nuclear plants are all assured that they will not suffer retaliation for disclosing wrongdoing within their agencies. H.R. 858 will also ensure that dedicated civil servants within the D.C. Superior Court will receive the statutory protection that they deserve for the disclosure of accurate information regarding mismanagement and abuse within the courts.

As the Vice-Chair of the D.C. Subcommittee, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of H.R. 858. Let me add that, in no way, do I mean to suggest that there is rampant mismanagement or abuse within the D.C. Superior Court. This legislation merely levels the playing field for Court employees and corrects an inequity in the law that will help to strengthen the D.C. court system. Protecting D.C. Superior Court employees who disclose government waste and mismanagement is a major step toward a more effective court system, which is essential to the revitalization of the District of Columbia.

Many of the 1,000 employees of the D.C. Superior Court live in my congressional district, and I am pleased to be part of this effort

to afford them the same whistleblower protections that cover all workers in the city of D.C. and throughout the federal government.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 858.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the District of Columbia Court Employees Whistleblower Protection Act of 1999 (H.R. 858).

My colleagues, this is important legislation. It deserves strong bi-partisan support.

As my good friends TOM DAVIS and ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON acknowledge this legislation is important to correct an error that has permitted employees of the District's Superior and Appeals Courts to operate without any whistleblower protection.

The error was probably an oversight.

As part of home-rule back in 1971, Congress fused the functions of state and municipal court functions to produce the D.C. Superior Court and the D.C. Court of Appeals.

Both courts are funded by the city, but their judges are nominated for 15-year terms by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Apparently no one sought or succeeded in extending the District's merit protection laws to court employees.

As a result, court employees have lacked the same whistleblower protections all other district government employees receive.

Unfortunately, it took a series of troubling events to bring this issue back to the attention of Congress.

Last fall, I was contacted by several court-appointed attorneys handling both criminal and child abuse cases who indicated that they were not being paid because the D.C. Superior Court was running out of money.

Some of these billable hours remained unpaid for up to 6 months.

From these initial calls, it became apparent that the Superior Court was facing a severe financial crisis.

Probing further a number of charges were raised about the Court's financial management practices.

These charges range from mismanagement to specific misdeeds.

On September 22, 1998, D.C. Appropriations Chairman Charles Taylor and I asked the General Accounting Office to conduct an audit of the Court's financial and personnel practices.

In response to reports that some court personnel were reluctant to cooperate with GAO's audit for fear of retaliation, I joined Reps. TOM DAVIS and ERNEST ISTOOK on January 26th of this year in a letter sent to Chief Judge Eugene Hamilton asking him to ensure that no court employees were retaliated against for cooperating with GAO auditors.

Judge Hamilton has assured us of his cooperation, but reports on employees' fear of retaliation have continued.

It is for this reason, that we are now compelled to move forward with whistleblower protection legislation.

It is my sincere hope that the Court will receive a clean audit, but it is critical Congress and the residents of the District of Columbia have full confidence that their courts operate with sound financial and personnel practices.

This legislation will help give us the confidence these goals are attainable.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 858.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 858.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD RETIREMENT PORTABILITY ACT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 807) to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide portability of service credit for persons who leave employment with the Federal Reserve Board to take positions with other Government agencies, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 807

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Reserve Board Retirement Portability Act".

SEC. 2. PORTABILITY OF SERVICE CREDIT.

(a) CREDITABLE SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 8411(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking "and" at the end of paragraph (3);

(B) in paragraph (4)—

(i) by striking "of the preceding provisions" and inserting "other paragraph"; and

(ii) by striking the period at the end and inserting "; and"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

"(5) a period of service (other than any service under any other paragraph of this subsection, any military service, and any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) that was creditable under the Bank Plan (as defined in subsection (i)), if the employee waives credit for such service under the Bank Plan and makes a payment to the Fund equal to the amount that would have been deducted from pay under section 8422(a) had the employee been subject to this chapter during such period of service (together with interest on such amount computed under paragraphs (2) and (3) of section 8334(e)).

Paragraph (5) shall not apply in the case of any employee as to whom subsection (g) (or, to the extent subchapter III of chapter 83 is involved, section 8332(n)) otherwise applies."

(2) BANK PLAN DEFINED.—Section 8411 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(i) For purposes of subsection (b)(5), the term 'Bank Plan' means the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System ap-

pointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of this chapter)."

(b) EXCLUSION FROM CHAPTER 84.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (2) of section 8402(b) of title 5, United States Code, is amended by striking the matter before subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

"(2)(A) any employee or Member who has separated from the service after—

"(i) having been subject to—

"(I) subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title;

"(II) subchapter I of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980; or

"(III) the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act; and

"(ii) having completed—

"(I) at least 5 years of civilian service creditable under subchapter III of chapter 83 of this title;

"(II) at least 5 years of civilian service creditable under subchapter I of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980; or

"(III) at least 5 years of civilian service (other than any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) creditable under the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1, 1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act,

determined without regard to any deposit or redeposit requirement under either such subchapter or under such benefit structure, or any requirement that the individual become subject to either such subchapter or to such benefit structure after performing the service involved; or"

(2) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (d) of section 8402 of title 5, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(d) Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) shall not apply to an individual who—

"(i) becomes subject to—

"(A) subchapter II of chapter 8 of title I of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (relating to the Foreign Service Pension System) pursuant to an election; or

"(B) the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of this chapter); and

"(2) subsequently enters a position in which, but for paragraph (2) of subsection (b), such individual would be subject to this chapter."

(c) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES.—A former employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who—

(1) has at least 5 years of civilian service (other than any service performed in the employ of a Federal Reserve Bank) creditable under the benefit structure for employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed before January 1,

1984, that is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act;

(2) was subsequently employed subject to the benefit structure in which employees of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System appointed on or after January 1, 1984, participate, which benefit structure is a component of the Retirement Plan for Employees of the Federal Reserve System, established under section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act (and any redesignated or successor version of such benefit structure, if so identified in writing by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for purposes of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code); and

(3) after service described in paragraph (2), becomes subject to and thereafter entitled to benefits under chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code,

shall, for purposes of section 302 of the Federal Employees' Retirement System Act of 1986 (100 Stat. 601; 5 U.S.C. 8331 note) be considered to have become subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, pursuant to an election under section 301 of such Act.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to succeeding provisions of this subsection, this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) PROVISIONS RELATING TO CREDITABILITY AND CERTAIN FORMER EMPLOYEES.—The amendments made by subsection (a) and the provisions of subsection (c) shall apply only to individuals who separate from service subject to chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, on or after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) PROVISIONS RELATING TO EXCLUSION FROM CHAPTER.—The amendments made by subsection (b) shall not apply to any former employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System who, subsequent to his or her last period of service as an employee of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and prior to the date of enactment of this Act, became subject to subchapter III of chapter 83 or chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, under the law in effect at the time of the individual's appointment.

SEC. 3. CERTAIN TRANSFERS TO BE TREATED AS A SEPARATION FROM SERVICE FOR PURPOSES OF THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

(a) AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 84 OF TITLE 5, UNITED STATES CODE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subchapter III of chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before section 8432 the following:

"§8431. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation

"(a) For purposes of this subchapter, separation from Government employment includes a transfer from a position that is subject to one of the retirement systems described in subsection (b) to a position that is not subject to any of them.

"(b) The retirement systems described in this subsection are—

"(1) the retirement system under this chapter;

"(2) the retirement system under subchapter III of chapter 83; and

"(3) any other retirement system under which individuals may contribute to the Thrift Savings Fund through withholdings from pay."

(2) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 84 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the item relating to section 8432 the following:

"8431. Certain transfers to be treated as a separation."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Subsection (b) of section 8351 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by redesignating paragraph (1) as paragraph (8), and by adding at the end the following:

"(9) For the purpose of this section, separation from Government employment includes a transfer described in section 8431."

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to transfers occurring before, on, or after the date of enactment of this Act, except that, for purposes of applying such amendments with respect to any transfer occurring before such date of enactment, the date of such transfer shall be considered to be the date of enactment of this Act. The Executive Director (within the meaning of section 8401(13) of title 5, United States Code) may prescribe any regulations necessary to carry out this subsection.

SEC. 4. CLARIFYING AMENDMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (f) of section 3304 of title 5, United States Code, as added by section 2 of Public Law 105-339, is amended—

(1) by striking paragraph (4);

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (2) and (3) as paragraphs (3) and (4), respectively; and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (1) the following:

"(2) If selected, a preference eligible or veteran described in paragraph (1) shall acquire competitive status and shall receive a career or career-conditional appointment, as appropriate."

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if enacted on October 31, 1998.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H.R. 807, as amended.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this morning I would like to take this opportunity to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Services, for introducing this legislation. I also would like to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the distinguished ranking member of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, for his strong support for this legislation.

I also want to take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), the chairman of the Committee on Government Reform, and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member, for their support on this bill and also moving it through the committee process in an expedited fashion. I also wanted to take this opportunity to extend my

congratulations and thanks to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for her strong support, not only of this legislation, but the gentlewoman is one of the most active individuals in the Congress in support of our Federal employees, no matter what capacity they serve our Federal Government in, and the citizens of America.

Mr. Speaker, this bipartisan legislation today will provide retirement portability for certain Federal Reserve Board employees who take jobs in our executive branch of government. This legislation will allow those employees who participate in the Board's FERS-like retirement plan, and FERS is our Federal Employee Retirement System, for those not familiar with the acronym, to obtain FERS credit for their Federal Reserve years when they transfer to another Federal agency.

□ 1145

The Federal Reserve already provides such reciprocity for employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve from other Federal agencies. Without this corrective legislation today, former Board employees would receive smaller annuities upon retirement than they otherwise should and they otherwise deserve.

This is a simple bill that also corrects an inequity in current law that prevents some Federal employees from withdrawing their funds from their Thrift Savings Plan accounts.

Under current law, employees participating in the Thrift Savings Plan who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board from other Federal agencies are not permitted to withdraw funds from their Thrift Savings Plan accounts.

Current law specifies that employees, and I will quote from the law, "must separate from government employment," in order to be entitled to withdraw funds. However, employment at the Board is considered to be government employment. Therefore, employees who transfer to the Board and commence participation in the Federal Reserve retirement plan may not withdraw the funds in their Thrift Savings Plan accounts.

Section 3 of this legislation corrects that problem by allowing our Federal employees who have transferred or will transfer to the Board to move the funds in their Thrift Savings accounts to the Board's thrift plan.

Mr. Speaker, sections 3's technical correction, along with the portability language in section 2, are appropriate and necessary remedies to ensure Board employees fair treatment under our current law.

Section 4 of this bill is also critically important to the men and women who have served our Nation under arms. It clarifies the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act that we passed last year to ensure that our veterans will receive their benefits that Congress intended when it passed the Act again in the last session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, with those opening comments, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) for moving swiftly to bring this bipartisan bill to the floor.

Under current law, if an employee of the Federal Reserve Board leaves to work for another Federal agency, the employee is required to join FERS, the Federal Employees Retirement System. Under the current FERS statute, time spent working at the Board after 1988 does not count as credible service towards a FERS annuity. This is simply not fair. As a result, these employees will receive smaller pensions upon retirement.

This outcome resulted from an oversight that occurred when the FERS statute was written in late 1980s. It affects Federal Reserve Board employees hired after 1983 who continued working at the Board after 1988.

In human terms, the problem affects approximately 50 employees who have already left the Board for other agencies. But if not addressed, it will potentially affect approximately 1,000 people, translating into 60 percent of the Board's current workforce should they move to other agencies and then retire under FERS.

In the long run, if the problem is left unaddressed, an ever-larger proportion of the Board's workforce will be potentially affected in the same manner.

Last week, H.R. 807 was marked up by full committee, and two amendments were offered and approved by the committee that further enhanced the bill, and a bill that Congress passed last year, the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act of 1998.

Due to an amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the bill will also allow current and future Federal employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board to transfer the funds from their FERS Thrift Savings accounts to the Federal Reserve through a savings plan.

At present, current law dictates that Federal employees who participate in the TSP, then transfer to the Board, cannot withdraw funds from their TSP account. The affected employees can no longer contribute money to their TSP or transfer money from their TSP accounts to the Board's thrift plan. They also lose the option to borrow money from their TSP, which is an option that should be available to them as Federal employees.

The Federal Reserve Board has requested this technical correction, and I am pleased to support it. During the last Congress, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), former chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, and myself, worked hard to see that the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act of 1998 be enacted. I applaud him for all of his efforts.

This Act improves the ability of veterans to compete during the Federal

hiring process, extends veterans' preference to all branches of the Federal Government, and instructs the Secretary of Labor to maintain a database of contractors who have filed reports on the number of veterans they have hired.

Since the enactment of this legislation, concerns have arisen regarding OPM's interpretation of a section of the Act providing for the hiring of veterans by Federal agencies. OPM interpreted the language in the act to mean that veterans could be hired for a Federal job as schedule B appointees rather than as career status appointees. Schedule B appointments are not afforded the same rights and privileges as career status employees.

This issue was discussed with our counterparts in the Senate and with OPM. All parties agreed that language was needed to clarify the original intent of the Congress. This clarifying language is reflected in the amendment of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA). Again I compliment him for that. The amendment will ensure American veterans are hired.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), chairman of the NRCC and also chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, who has brought the District of Columbia from the depths of disaster to fiscal soundness.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time. The introduction is longer than my speech, I am afraid.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 807, the Federal Reserve Board Retirement Portability Act introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor.

This bill correct two technical oversights that significantly harm the ability of the 1,700 Reserve Board employees who work at the facility's Washington headquarters to pursue career opportunities open to all other Federal employees.

This legislation will accord Federal Reserve Board employees, many of whom live in my District, some of the same privileges that other Federal employees enjoy. The Board currently has its own retirement plan covering employees hired prior to 1984 under the Civil Service Retirement System as well as a bank plan for those hired after that date.

Those covered under the CSRS plan have had the pension reciprocity and enjoyed pension civil service portability. Unfortunately, due to a technical oversight when the Federal retirement system, the FERS system, was created, those employees covered solely by the bank plan are not allowed to credit their service with the Federal Reserve to FERS if they leave for another employment opportunity within

the Executive Branch. Conversely, under current Federal law, Federal employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board are given portability.

The result of this oversight is that Board employees may face a reduced pension that does not accurately reflect their years of service to the Federal Government. As a matter of fact, Federal Reserve Board employees may collect a reduced pension from both the FERS and the Board plan that does not equal a FERS pension corrected to reflect continuous government service. This problem hinders the career opportunities of Board employees and limits the ability of other Federal Government agencies to recruit those individuals.

H.R. 807 also makes another technical correction to allow Federal employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board from other Federal agencies to have access to their Thrift Savings Plan. Presently, Federal employees who transfer to the Board cannot access their TSP, nor can they roll those TSP dollars over to the Board's thrift plan. Again, this harms the employment opportunities of Federal employees and limits some of the choices they might otherwise enjoy.

H.R. 807 will give the Federal Reserve Board the necessary tools to attract the most qualified candidates from within the Executive Branch.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), chairman of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and his pinch-hitter today, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), former chairman, who endorses this legislation. It is a worthwhile bill that deserves the support of every Member.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 807, the Federal Reserve Board Retirement Portability Act introduced by Representative SCARBOROUGH and of which I am proud to be a cosponsor. This bill corrects two technical oversights that significantly harm the ability of the 1700 Federal Reserve Board employees who work at the facility's Washington headquarters to pursue career opportunities open to other federal employees.

This legislation will accord Federal Reserve Board employees—many of whom live in my Congressional district—some of the same privileges that other federal employees enjoy. The Federal Reserve Board currently has its own retirement plan covering employees hired prior to 1984 under the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) as well as a Bank plan for those hired after that date. Those covered under the CSRS plan have had pension reciprocity and enjoyed pension civil service portability. Unfortunately, due to a technical oversight when the Federal Retirement System (FERS) was created, those employees covered solely by the bank plan are not allowed to credit their service with the Federal Reserve to FERS if they leave for another employment opportunity within the Executive branch. Conversely, under current law, Federal employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board are given portability.

The result of this oversight is that Board employees may face a reduced pension that

does not accurately reflect their years of service to the federal government. As a matter of fact, Federal Reserve Board employees may collect a reduced pension from both the FERS and the Board plan that does not equal a FERS pension corrected to reflect continuous government service. This problem hinders the career opportunities of Federal Reserve employees and limits the ability of other federal government agencies to recruit these individuals.

H.R. 807 also makes another technical correction to allow federal employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board from other federal agencies to have access to their Thrift Savings Plans (TSP). Presently, federal employees who transfer to the Federal Reserve Board cannot access their TSP, nor can they roll those TSP dollars over to the Board's thrift plan. Again, this harms the employment opportunities of federal employees and limits some of the choices they might otherwise enjoy. H.R. 807 will give the Federal Reserve Board the necessary tools to attract the most qualified candidates from within the Executive Branch.

H.R. 807 substantially corrects these problems and it recognizes the importance of treating all federal employees fairly. When we ignore these technical oversights, we send our federal employees the wrong message. By addressing the retirement program problems at the Federal Reserve, we enhance that Agency's ability to attract and retain the most qualified individuals.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Chairman of the Civil Service Subcommittee for introducing this legislation. H.R. 807 is a worthwhile bill that deserves the support of every Member, and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote in favor of this legislation.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for his comments. I agree with him. This legislation is extremely important. Although it affects 50 people now and will eventually affect 1,000 people, this is a perfect example of the Congress working in a bipartisan manner to put a face on legislation and to address the problems that these Members of the Federal Reserve System are facing.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this bill, H.R. 807. Through the portability, it provides equity for those employees who so deserve it. It is indeed a bipartisan piece of legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) for introducing it, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), ranking member of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and all of the Members who have voted unanimously on a committee level in favor of this bill

which allows the Federal Reserve Board employees to count their years of service there toward a civil service retirement plan if they later work for another government agency.

It is the kind of equity that we must offer our employees to be able to recruit and retain the very finest as we currently have. So I am most supportive of this legislation; and, as the ranking minority member mentioned, I hope that this is a hallmark and a prototype of continued bipartisan legislation to help our civil service.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers, but I just want to reemphasize the fact that this legislation is one that just shows how fast this Congress can move. When we heard about the problems, when the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), our former chairman, was chairman heard about this problem during testimony, we immediately moved to address it. We set deadlines that were met.

I think that that is the way Americans want their government to work. This time we have gotten this legislation in early. We will do everything in our power of course to make sure that it moves swiftly through the other body.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to focus some attention for a few moments on section 4 of H.R. 807. This section is particularly important to our Nation's veterans. I want to thank again the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), who is the chairman now of the Subcommittee on Civil Service, and also thank again the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member, for their strong support for this section and revision that has been provided space in this bill.

When the Committee on Government Reform marked up H.R. 807, I was able to add section 4 in order to perfect the language of Public Law 105-339, the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act, which passed in the last session in 1998. That bill, which I had the pleasure of introducing with others in the House, expanded veterans employment opportunities and strengthened veterans preference in our civil service system.

□ 1200

It was an important bill to our Nation's veterans. In fact, it was called the most significant veterans preference legislation since World War II and was strongly supported by every one of our Nation's veterans service organizations.

A key provision of that act allowed veterans to compete for civil service jobs even if they did not have the sta-

tus as Federal employees. Before the act was passed, competition for many jobs was limited to current Federal employees. However, after the act was passed, the Office of Personnel Management raised an important technical issue. OPM held that individuals who were selected under this provision could not be appointed to competitive service unless they already had what is known as competitive status. Instead, the Office of Personnel Management instructed agencies to provide these individuals with excepted service appointments.

As excepted service employees, these veterans would have, in fact, fewer rights than their colleagues in the competitive service. Most importantly, as excepted service employees, these veterans would not be able to compete for other agency jobs under internal merit promotion procedures. This was not what I intended; this was not what Congress intended. Congress intended that veterans appointed under this provision would have all of the rights of their fellow employees in a particular agency.

Mr. Speaker, the majority and the minority staffs of the Subcommittee on Civil Service and of the Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs met with the Office of Personnel Management's experts to discuss this problem. Section 4 enacts language suggested by the Office of Personnel Management. Under this language, in fact, veterans who are selected under the access provision of the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act will receive competitive appointments and competitive status. That is what we intended and that is what Congress wants. They will have the same rights as their coworkers.

Mr. Speaker, we have discussed this situation extensively with veterans' organizations and various service groups represented by veterans. They are keenly interested in resolving this problem and have urged Congress to act as quickly as possible to correct and clarify this situation and cure this problem. They strongly support section 4, and I urge all Members to support section 4 and also this legislation.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this bill is really about fairness. The Federal Reserve already allows Federal employees who transfer there to receive credit for their years of service at other agencies. Congress should provide reciprocal rights under the Federal employees' retirement system for those Federal Reserve employees who transfer to other agencies, particularly when the cost is negligible. Likewise, there is no reason to deny individuals who transfer to the Federal Reserve the right to withdraw their funds from their own thrift savings plan accounts.

Section 4 of this bill, as I stated, is extremely important to our Nation's veterans. It will, again, clarify the meaning of the Veterans Employment Opportunities Act, which was passed in the last Congress. Congress intended

that those veterans selected for Federal employment under the access provisions of that act would have the very same rights as their coworkers and compete for other jobs. Both Republicans and Democrats support this legislation, as does the administration. We have worked very closely with the Federal Reserve Board, the Office of Personnel Management, the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, and others in crafting the language before the House of Representatives this morning.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 807, as amended, is a good piece of legislation, a bipartisan piece of legislation, and a fair bill. It is important to our Federal employees at the Federal Reserve Board, it is also important to those who have served our Nation. I urge all Members to vote for H.R. 807, as amended.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 807, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

"A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide portability of service credit for persons who leave employment with the Federal Reserve Board to take positions with other Government agencies, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RECOGNIZING AND HONORING JOE DIMAGGIO

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 105) recognizing and honoring Joe DiMaggio.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 105

Whereas Joseph Paul ("Joe") DiMaggio was born in Martinez, California, on November 25, 1914;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio was the son of Sicilian immigrants, Joseph Paul and Rosalia DiMaggio, and was the 2nd of 3 brothers to play Major League Baseball;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio played 13 seasons in the major leagues, all for the New York Yankees;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio, who wore Number 5 in Yankee pinstripes, became a baseball icon in the 1941 season by hitting safely in 56 consecutive games, a major league record that has stood for more than 5 decades and has never been seriously challenged;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio compiled a .325 batting average during his storied career and played on 9 World Series championship teams;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio was selected to the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1955, 4 years after his retirement, in his 1st year of eligibility;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio in 1969 was voted Major League Baseball's greatest living player;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio served the Nation in World War II as a member of the Army Air Corps;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio was tireless in helping others and was devoted to the "Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital" in Hollywood, Florida;

Whereas Joe DiMaggio will be remembered as a role model for generations of young people; and

Whereas Joe DiMaggio transcended baseball and will remain a symbol for the ages of talent, commitment, and achievement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives recognizes and honors Joe DiMaggio—

(1) for his storied baseball career;

(2) for his many contributions to the Nation throughout his lifetime; and

(3) for transcending baseball and becoming a symbol for the ages of talent, commitment, and achievement.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 105, recognizing and honoring Joe DiMaggio.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, Joseph Paul DiMaggio was a man of grace, class and of dignity. He was a modern day American icon, hero and a gentleman.

Joe DiMaggio was born in Martinez, California, on November 25, 1914, the son of Sicilian immigrants and one of nine children. At the age of 18 he joined the San Francisco Seals of the Pacific Coast League and began his career in baseball that would make him one of the most popular men to ever play at America's favorite pastime.

In 1936, Joe DiMaggio became a "Yankee" and remained so for the rest of his life. During his 13 seasons he played in 10 world series and 11 All-Star games. He was the American League's most valuable player for three seasons. In 1941 he set the untouchable record for the longest hitting streak with 56 consecutive games, and in 1955 major league baseball set Joe DiMaggio's name in stone by inducting him into baseball's Hall of Fame. To some he was "Joltin' Joe", to others he was the "Yankee Clipper", but to baseball he remained a legend.

Moreover, Joe DiMaggio's life goes far beyond his on-field extensive achievements. He was a patriot and an ambassador of humanity. In 1943, he volunteered to serve his Nation in

World War II. In 1986, he was awarded the Ellis Island Medal of Honor. He founded the Joe DiMaggio's Children Hospital Foundation to provide the highest quality health care for our Nation's most precious possessions. Joe DiMaggio's dedication is an example of class and dignity to every American.

In conclusion, I am proud to take this time on the floor today to remember Joe DiMaggio. The image of number 5, running gracefully through centerfield in Yankee Stadium making another deceptively easy catch, is a symbol to America, one that we will never forget. We thank "Gentleman Joe" for being an inspiration to our Nation.

Accordingly, I urge all Members to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my thanks and the appreciation of the Congress to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), both of whom hail from the other city with a great baseball team, for introducing H. Res. 105 honoring Joe DiMaggio.

Baseball Commissioner, Bud Selig, in commenting on the death of Joe DiMaggio, stated, and I quote: "For several generations of baseball fans, Joe was the personification of grace, class and dignity on the baseball diamond. His persona extended beyond the playing field and touched all of our hearts. In many respects, as an immigrant's son, he represented the hopes and ideals of our great country."

This high praise for a man born in a small fishing village 25 miles from northeast of San Francisco is indeed a wonderful tribute. But it was Emerson who said it best when he said, "It is better to judge a man not by his station in life but what he has done to get there." And so the story of Joe DiMaggio is one that, by anybody's measuring stick, would have to be termed a great life.

Joe DiMaggio's father expected him to become a fisherman, like his brothers, but Joe had different dreams. He dreamt of fields and diamonds. He dreamt of playing the game of baseball.

In 1932, at the age of 17, he began his professional baseball career, playing in three games for the San Francisco Seals of the Pacific coast. He played his first major league game on May 3 of 1936 at Yankee Stadium against the St. Louis Browns.

Joe DiMaggio served the Yankees as one of the best outfielders to play the game. Nicknamed the "Yankee Clipper", for his superb fielding ability, DiMaggio was a great offensive player as well. He set a major league record by establishing a 56 game hitting streak in 1941. And as one who loves the game of baseball, I can tell my colleagues that is a great, great feat.

DiMaggio played in 10 World Series, and was the American League's most valuable player in 1939, 1941 and 1947. In

1948, he led the league with 39 home runs and 155 runs batted in. He ended his phenomenal baseball career with 361 runs in 1,736 games. He was inducted into the Baseball Hall of Fame in 1955.

In 1986, DiMaggio received the Ellis Island Medal of Honor for both his achievements on the baseball field as well as for being a worthy role model for past, present and future youth of America. In a recent interview on "60 Minutes", DiMaggio talked about his role as a role model, and he said that he felt blessed that so many people looked up to him and looked to him for strength and for a person who they could follow behind.

For all his glory, Joe DiMaggio was a quiet man, who took pride in who he was and what he did. He had a basic set of values that went untainted by his celebrity status.

DiMaggio's field of dreams took him from a fishing town in San Francisco to the bright lights of New York City and made him, indeed, a baseball great. He gave baseball fans around the world something to cheer about, but more importantly, he gave us all something to believe in, and it is simply called the American Dream.

Joe DiMaggio was a true hero and a gentleman, and I am pleased to support this resolution in his honor.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the distinguished cochairman of our New York delegation, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), for having brought this matter to the floor at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG).

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in expressing my strong support for this resolution honoring the accomplishments of the great Joe DiMaggio.

Like millions of other young boys of the era, Joe DiMaggio was my hero. I never met him, I never saw him play, and only on occasion did I hear him on the radio. The Yankees won so many world championships that was always possible, it seemed, in the fall of the year.

The Yankee Clipper's grace and skill on the field were inspirational, and they fostered a deeper understanding and love of the game of baseball in everyone, and particularly to those who did get a chance to see him in action.

During his storied career, which was interrupted by his honorable service to our country in World War II, Joe DiMaggio led the Yankees to nine world championships and compiled a lifetime batting average of .325.

These accomplishments aside, he will always be best remembered for the 1941 season in which he established one of the sport's most enduring records by hitting safely in 56 consecutive games. After that record was broken, he immediately continued another streak of 16 games.

Mr. Speaker, Joe DiMaggio was an American icon. His stature, presence and commitment to excellence transcended the baseball diamond and left an indelible impact on the culture of our great Nation.

□ 1215

His accomplishments, along with his style and grace, both on and off the field will never be forgotten.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), one of my mentors and just one of our greatest Congressmen and an admirer of Joe DiMaggio.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, let me commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the ranking member; the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH), the chairman; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN); and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) for moving so swiftly in bringing this bipartisan measure to the floor. And as one who chairs our great New York delegation, which is probably the most bipartisan delegation we have in this House, let me thank my long and dear friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for assisting in bringing our members together to pay tribute to a hero that far too often we thought just belonged to us.

Joe DiMaggio and the New York Yankees are like treasures that you take for granted. And when word came of his ill health, there was no member of the delegation or hardly anybody that was known from New York that did not receive sympathy cards and get well cards as though we just lived around the corner from Joe.

As many times as I have had the pleasure of going to Yankee Stadium and hearing the roar of the crowd both for an active playing Joe DiMaggio or for retired gentleman hero Joe DiMaggio, the class that he brought not just to the Yankees, not just to New York, but to America is something that we have to see and we have to feel.

I was so amazed and indeed surprised to hear from so many Italian Americans to talk about what Joe meant to them. And it was so pleasant to see that, with all of the discrimination and anti-Italian feelings that we have had in this country in the years gone by, that Italian Americans felt that Joe just shattered the image of the Mafia, shattered the image of how Italians were portrayed in our motion pictures and television. And I said, my God, don't you understand, Frank Guarini, who is a former member of Congress and who heads up the National Italian American Foundation, that you may think of Joe as just being a famous and an outstanding Italian American but the people in Harlem and in Bed-Stuy and in the South Bronx were all weeping when we lost Joe DiMaggio.

Sure, he was a classic example of how anybody, no matter what their background, could achieve the high levels of

respect and admiration and love. But he also was one that transcended being an Italian American or Jewish American or black American because he played the game and allowed everyone to believe that if they played it fairly and carried themselves in a decent way that this country would respect them.

Let us, I say to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), say to Joe that he fought for all of us, not Italian Americans. Let us say, the best way to pay tribute to Joe is to try to live our lives the way he lived his. Let us look at all Americans as though, no matter where they came from, give them an opportunity to achieve and they, like our great Joe DiMaggio, can excel.

I believe that one thing that stands out in the greatness of this man is that he never took failure as being an option for him. He starred and yet he acted as though he was just a bat boy when we were in his presence. Few Americans, few people can carry the heavy toll of being so well-known. He did it. He did it well. He sets an example for America and indeed an example for this Congress.

Let me thank all of my colleagues that made it possible for us to bring this to the floor. We brought it to the floor thinking we were honoring a fellow New Yorker and New York Yankee. We know better. We are honoring a great American and a great member of this great world that we live in.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York, our co-chairman of our New York delegation, for again bringing this measure to the floor and giving us the opportunity to recognize this hero of American baseball, a hero of many other endeavors, Joe DiMaggio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW).

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time.

I would like to associate my remarks with both of the gentlemen from New York. Joe DiMaggio was a constituent of mine living in Hollywood, Florida. And when the Hall of Famer Joe DiMaggio died last week, baseball fans of course lost a great hero. However, the children of south Florida lost more than a hero. They lost an advocate.

While humbly turning away the attention of adults, Joe DiMaggio always had time for children. During his years of retirement in south Florida, the baseball great was particularly concerned with helping alleviating the pain and loneliness of sick children. As a result of his concern and compassion, the Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital was dedicated in Hollywood, Florida in 1992.

Although he ordinarily shied away from celebrity events and public attention, Joe DiMaggio faithfully made exceptions for the children at the hospital. Without fail, Joe DiMaggio lent his name and his efforts to fund-raising events and publicity for the hospital, including the annual celebrity baseball game fund-raiser. His aim was to improve the quality and accessibility of

medical services for children of all economic classes. Because of this, no child is turned away from the Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital due to lack of financial resources.

But the most special gift Joe DiMaggio gave to the Children's Hospital was his personal time. Each month, without fanfare, Joe DiMaggio would roam the halls of the ward which bears his name visiting with sick children and their families, posing for pictures, telling stories, signing autographs, and giving an encouraging word or just a gentle smile. Knowing of his great regard for personal privacy, I see that these acts were a great sacrifice for DiMaggio which he made for the suffering kids.

Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to Joe DiMaggio for his contributions to Broward and Dade Counties. Like the rest of the Nation, I am saddened by the loss of this hero of children. While his Hall of Fame records may be broken, Joe DiMaggio's healing touch in the halls of the Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital will live on forever.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

One author said, Mr. Speaker, that when people who are important to us die, when people who have had an impact on our lives pass on, a small part of us dies with him. And there is no question, as I listen to my colleagues today and I listen to the sponsor of this resolution, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others, that I realize that we were blessed, truly blessed, to have our lives eclipsed by Joe DiMaggio's and to be touched by his life.

I can remember as a small boy hearing about DiMaggio and growing up in a neighborhood where we did not play on grass but we played on glass, as I often say, but the fact is, when we saw heroes and heard about heroes like Jackie Robinson and Joe DiMaggio and others, it made us realize that we could accomplish things too. And as I listen to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), he is absolutely right, Joe DiMaggio was not only a hero for New Yorkers but he was a hero for youngsters in Baltimore and New Orleans and the West Coast, all over our country, and not just this country, Mr. Speaker, but also the world.

Paul Simon, in one of his songs "Mrs. Robinson" stated these words. He said, "Where have you gone, Joe DiMaggio? A nation turns its lonely eyes to you." Well, I think it can be safely said that Joe DiMaggio's spirit, his humility, and his grace lives in all of us who have been touched by his life.

One author said that when one goes through the difficult times of life and they are unseen, unnoticed, unappreciated, and unapplauded, it is those moments that bring about a certain obscurity but those who work hard in obscurity that are best able to address the fame and the glory of greatness.

And I think that, as we have listened and shared our thoughts here today, it is clear that God created a wonderful, wonderful road for Joe DiMaggio to walk but at the same time gave him the humility, the strength, and the power to walk it.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I would just simply ask all of our colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased that another one of my mentors, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who originally hailed from Baltimore but decided to move to San Francisco, is here. And she, too, is a tremendous baseball fan and an admirer of Joe DiMaggio.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman for yielding and for his kind comments.

Yes, I am from Baltimore. And it was in the 1940s I remember as a little, little girl when Joe DiMaggio came to Baltimore in the 1940s to have, I think it was, a heel operation at Johns Hopkins University. My much older brother, Thomas D'Alesandro—just kidding—interviewed him for the Loyola College newspaper at that time, the Greyhound, and that was the thrill of all time for all of us. Because Joe DiMaggio was, of course, the great star.

I was teasing our colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), about the fact that he beat San Franciscans to the punch, and the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), they beat us to the punch with this resolution. Because while he was a Yankee, the Yankee Clipper, and while he always thought of himself in those terms, he was a San Franciscan and we claim him with great pride.

His experience was that of many Italian immigrant families. He was raised partially in North Beach and then his family moved. He built a home when he was making \$100,000 a year for his parents in the Marina district, which is a trip of not many blocks but a great distance for many Italian Americans at the time, in fact, a trip that the Pelosi family made from North Beach to the Marina as well.

So, as a San Franciscan, I rise to convey the sadness of my constituents on the passing of Joe DiMaggio. We thought he would live forever, certainly his fame, his celebrity and his great dignity will, but also to express the pride of the Italian American community in his success.

Many fans and sports writers consider Joe DiMaggio the best all-around player of all time. But that is not the only reason why this son of Italian immigrants who grew up in San Francisco's fishing community could to this day force millions around the world to pause at the mere mention of his name.

Yes, it is the 56-game hitting streak and the speed on the base paths and the quick dash to the center field that made Joe DiMaggio a great American hero. It is also because, through all of his success, through all of his acclamation and praise, Joe DiMaggio was a modest man devoted to family, friends, and fans. He was a hero we could look up to without reservation or hesitation.

Mr. Speaker, it might interest my colleagues to know that during the earthquake of 1989, the Marina district, where Joe DiMaggio's home was, was severely devastated by the earthquake. And as a congressional office, of course we had to help or constituents. But the sight that was so impressive to so many of us was Joe DiMaggio standing in line like just any other person from the Marina to get assistance from FEMA, not assistance but the direction where do we go from here on that. So through it all, he was, as I say, a modest man. He died as he had lived, quietly surrounded by friends and carrying the great dignity for which he will always be remembered.

As a San Franciscan, as an Italian American, as an American, I thank my colleagues for this resolution and remembering the Yankee Clipper, San Franciscan, Joe DiMaggio.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Joe DiMaggio, Baseball Hall of Famer and American icon, who passed away the morning of March 8.

Joe DiMaggio was the personification of grace, class and dignity on the baseball diamond. He was the centerpiece of baseball's most storied franchise, leading the New York Yankees to nine World Series titles in his 12 seasons. He was named to the all-star team every season he played, won three American League most valuable player awards, was a lifetime .325 hitter and his 56 game hitting streak in 1941 still stands as one of the most impressive and untouchable records in all of sports.

Mr. Speaker, Joe DiMaggio performed with an elegance and grace that commanded the respect of both his fans and fellow players. His persona on the field also made him one of the most recognizable and beloved figures off it. Although his demeanor was reserved almost to the point of being aloof, in his case lack of emotion could not be confused with lack of intensity. Nobody played harder than Joltin' Joe, even if a score was lopsided or a pennant already clinched. When asked why he played with such fire, DiMaggio replied simply, "Because there might be someone out there who has never seen me play before."

It was this tireless work ethic and professionalism that set Joseph Paul DiMaggio apart from his peers. In modern day sports, too often players are criticized for selfishness, lack of intensity or being overly concerned with money. Mr. Speaker, none of these qualities were ever attributed to the Yankee Clipper, a great ballplayer, a great man, a great American. Thanks for the memories, Joe. You will be sorely missed, in New York and beyond.

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, according to biographer Richard Ben Cramer, Joe DiMaggio was upset to be placed prematurely in past tense by Paul Simon in his

song from "The Graduate". "Joltin' Joe has left and gone away," sang Simon. "What're they talking about?" shot back the Yankee Clipper, "I haven't gone anywhere."

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to an American hero. Joe DiMaggio was the first of his kind, a sports legend of the stature only 20th Century America could nurture. He was also one of the last of his breed, a celebrity of shy, quiet dignity.

The son of a fisherman and high school drop out, Joltin' Joe learned the game that would make him famous hitting with a broken oar. He played semipro ball beginning at the age of 18, but by the age of 21, he had debuted with much panache in the majors. The New York Yankees scored perhaps their best hit as a team when they recruited Joe DiMaggio to play center field in 1936.

There was no one like him in the game. What other players had to work at, DiMaggio did with an innate ability that often surprised even the greats. In a professional career lasting only 13 seasons, he won three MVPs, and led the Yankees to ten pennants and nine World Series championships.

After his retirement in 1951, DiMaggio continued to make Americans' lives a little sweeter. His devotion to children, possibly strengthened by his estrangement from his own son, was evident in his commitment to the Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital Foundation and the Joe DiMaggio Children's Hospital in Hollywood, Florida. Through his service, children and their families in South Florida could finally receive the specialized medical services they require.

Joltin' Joe passed away on March 8, 1999, and Paul Simon's words still ring true, "A nation turns its lonely eyes to you," not because we lack for great players in the many professional sports that pass our time today, but because in this commercialized age, we lack for heroes—the kind that legends are made of and the kind who, no matter what, maintain their public dignity. Joe DiMaggio did it, and there will never be another like him.

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Resolution honoring Joe DiMaggio.

Joe DiMaggio was more than just a terrific ballplayer—he was special to Americans across our country because of his professionalism, his work ethic, and his remarkable grace.

We honor Joe DiMaggio for that, and we honor him as well for the particular importance he had for millions of Italian-Americans. It's easy to forget today how ingrained prejudices were sixty years ago. In 1939, *Life* magazine printed what it believed was a favorable profile of Joe DiMaggio. In the article, however, it noted that "Instead of olive oil or smelly bear grease, DiMaggio keeps his hair slick with water. He never reeks of garlic and prefers chicken chow mein to spaghetti."

For a generation of Italian-Americans facing daily bigotry, Joe DiMaggio was a hero whose quiet dignity and excellence shattered stereotypes and eloquently rebutted ignorance.

Casey Stengel once modestly and astutely said that "I know I'm a better manager when Joe DiMaggio's in center field." Mr. Speaker, I would only add to that that we have been a better country because Joe DiMaggio was an American.

□ 1230

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to unanimously support the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 105.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO DECLARATION OF PALESTINIAN STATE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 24) expressing congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urging the President to assert clearly United States opposition to such a unilateral declaration of statehood.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 24

Whereas at the heart of the Oslo peace process lies the basic, irrevocable commitment made by Palestinian Chairman Yasir Arafat that, in his words, "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations";

Whereas resolving the political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority while ensuring Israel's security is one of the central issues of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict;

Whereas a declaration of statehood by the Palestinians outside the framework of negotiations would, therefore, constitute a most fundamental violation of the Oslo process;

Whereas Yasir Arafat and other Palestinian leaders have repeatedly threatened to declare unilaterally the establishment of a Palestinian state;

Whereas the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state would introduce a dramatically destabilizing element into the Middle East, risking Israeli countermeasures, a quick descent into violence, and an end to the entire peace process; and

Whereas, in light of continuing statements by Palestinian leaders, United States opposition to any unilateral Palestinian declaration of statehood should be made clear and unambiguous: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the final political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority can only be determined through negotiations and agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority;

(2) any attempt to establish Palestinian statehood outside the negotiating process will invoke the strongest congressional opposition; and

(3) the President should unequivocally assert United States opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, making clear that such a declaration would be a grievous violation of the Oslo accords and that a declared state would not be recognized by the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDESON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this measure.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 24. It is a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress against a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urging our President to assert clearly our Nation's opposition to such a unilateral declaration of statehood.

Mr. Speaker, over 280 Members of the House have cosponsored this measure, introduced by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), our colleague on the Committee on International Relations. I am pleased to cosponsor this measure with the gentleman from Arizona, and I thank him for his support of this critical issue.

Of concern to many of us, Mr. Speaker, since the signing of the Oslo Accords back in September of 1993 has been PLO Chairman Arafat's ongoing claim to unilaterally declare an independent Palestinian state on May 4, 1999. Despite recent contentions that he will not do so, regrettably Chairman Arafat has not yet categorically and publicly reversed that position.

Support has been growing in both the House and Senate for this resolution, a resolution opposing a unilateral declaration of independence. The Senate sent a clear message just last week when its measure was adopted by a significant vote of 98-1.

H. Con. Res. 24 expresses the opposition of the House to a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, simply because every issue in dispute between the Israelis and Palestinians must be negotiated in order to be resolved. A unilateral declaration of statehood by Chairman Arafat automatically falls outside the Oslo negotiating framework and would, therefore, constitute a fundamental and an extremely serious violation of the Oslo Accords.

H. Con. Res. 24 goes on to note that President Clinton should make clear that our Nation is opposed to such a declaration and that if such a declaration were to be made, our Nation would consider it a gross violation of the agreements already signed between the PLO and Israel and, moreover, would not be recognized by our Nation.

Chairman Arafat is expected to meet this coming week with President Clinton in Washington. Therefore, the consideration of H. Con. Res. 24 by the

House sends a distinct message to both Chairman Arafat and to President Clinton that Congress is unalterably opposed to such a dangerous unilateral declaration.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of Members interested in speaking on this suspension, as the chorus of opposition to a unilateral declaration of statehood grows stronger each day. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues' support for H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished committee ranking member for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I have no illusions as to what the outcome of this vote will be, but I think it is necessary to rise in opposition to this resolution. It is well-intended, I am sure, and I certainly respect the sponsors of it and certainly respect the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

The administration, Mr. Speaker, is unmistakably on record as opposing a Palestinian unilateral declaration of statehood. There is no real need for this resolution and particularly at this time, a very sensitive time in the Middle East itself.

In a letter from the State Department to the gentleman from New York, our esteemed chairman of the Committee on International Relations, dated March 9, U.S. policy was clearly stated, that the administration opposes unilateral actions, but it goes further in stating, and I quote:

"We believe that any congressional resolution should make clear our opposition to all unilateral acts." I stress the word "all," which the letter does in several different cases. "Singling out one side would not be as effective as stressing what both parties have already committed themselves to do."

Simply put, it was not only the Palestinians who signed the Oslo Agreement and later the Wye Accords. Israeli commitments as well should be reiterated in any congressional resolution on this subject. H. Con. Res. 24 simply fails to mention the other half of the equation. Failure to mention both parties in this resolution is only rhetoric aimed at this particular sensitive point in Israeli political elections at tilting the side toward one side or the other.

I reiterate that while I may be opposed to a unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood at this time, although that does not make me in opposition to a Palestinian state, this particular resolution is one-sided and comes in an untimely manner and an untimely fashion for this Congress to be considering. I oppose the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the distinguished majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for bringing this resolution to the floor, and I particularly thank the gentleman from Arizona not only for bringing this resolution but for his courtesy.

I rise to state that the United States position on the Middle East peace process must be made perfectly clear. Unilateral announcement of an independent Palestinian state cannot be accepted.

Yasser Arafat's plan to announce Palestinian statehood when the Oslo Accords expire is nothing more than an attempt to shatter a fragile peace in the Middle East. Israel is an island of democracy surrounded by hostile enemies. Defending this lone democracy in the Middle East should be nothing short of a crusade for America.

The Clinton administration tries to govern with words only, typically talking on both sides of every issue. A successful foreign policy cannot be built upon equivocation and confusion. It is no wonder that the Israelis are worried about U.S. support. Every time peace talks stall, it is Israel that is expected to surrender more territory and concede more diplomatic ground to come to the negotiating table.

Mr. Speaker, peace depends on the willing participation and agreement of both parties. Any unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state must be clearly condemned for all time by the United States. American silence now will spell chaos in the Middle East in the future. I urge my colleagues to support the Salmon resolution and send a very clear message not only to Israel but the world that we stand beside Israel.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I think that we are missing an opportunity here. It is frankly somewhat sad. We are at a stage in the peace process that is probably more tenuous than at any time since Oslo. It is clear by every assessment, from the Israelis and the Americans as well, that the Palestinians are fulfilling their obligations with every possible effort.

We find ourselves here today with a resolution that does not even quote the President correctly. It says the President should. The President has already come out against a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state. But the President rightly goes on to say there should not be unilateral actions by either party.

We have elections in Israel, we have some politics here at home as well, but what is frightening to me is that some Members have not recognized the change that has occurred in the Middle East. In Israel, from Sharon to the far left, we now have unanimity that working with the Palestinians and coming to an agreement is the most important act for the security of their families and children. But here in the Congress, we have to find people that are harder line than even the Israeli

government under Mr. Netanyahu. Everyone agrees that I know in this Chamber that there should not be a unilateral declaration of statehood. But I think not to recognize the change that has occurred in the Middle East, with the Palestinians at the PNC officially removing the language that offended the Netanyahu government even though the Labor government before argued that language had already been removed, that we continue to deal with the Palestinians not as if they were partners in the peace process but the same adversaries they were in the past I think is a mistake.

For those of us who care about the children and the women who die in marketplace bombings, who worry about the poverty and starvation in camps, we need to move this peace process forward and we need to take opportunities like this one not simply to single out one side, especially at a point in history where there is hope for a comprehensive peace. I hope that we will find ourselves in the future recognizing the change that has occurred in the Middle East, that Mr. Netanyahu and Mr. Peres and Mr. Rabin have all been negotiating in good faith with Mr. Arafat, that we want no unilateral actions, and that this resolution, and I do not want to put judgments on the motivation of the sponsors, but in my opinion is not helpful coming at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), the sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, this resolution we are considering today is clear-cut but critical. It expresses congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urges the President to do the same. As far as the comments that were just made regarding the intentions of the sponsor or the cosponsors, I am glad that the gentleman did not question the motives of this cosponsor since it would implicate over 280 Members of the House and 98 Senators in the Senate who voted for this resolution who believe that this is an idea whose time has come, who believe that rather than spout rhetoric it is time to be ahead of the curve and make sure that the Palestinian authority understand that our intentions are clear so that we can avert bloodshed.

The consensus on the need for this resolution is clear. As I mentioned, over 200 Members of the House have cosponsored H. Con. Res. 24. I worked diligently with Democrats as well on this bill. I believe that the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. ACKERMAN), the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and some of my other friends on the other side of

the aisle can attest to this. Language that criticized the administration was removed, even though we all know that the administration, had the administration reacted sooner against the possibility of a unilaterally declared Palestinian state, Chairman Arafat would probably not be meeting with President Clinton this week to discuss the matter. There is also no reference in the resolution about the First Lady's damaging comments on the subject which may have encouraged a belief with many in the Palestinian Authority that the U.S. might support and recognize such a unilaterally declared state.

We must act now. The Palestinian Authority plans to unilaterally declare parts of Israel, including Jerusalem, as their own state as early as May 4 of this year, the target date the Oslo Accords set for a permanent accord to be reached. Doing so would obliterate Oslo and would mark a repudiation of the commitment of Chairman Arafat to negotiate all permanent status issues. At the start of the Oslo process, 4 days before the famous September 13, 1993 White House lawn ceremony that publicly launched the peace process, Chairman Arafat wrote a letter to then Israeli prime minister Yitzhak Rabin, in which he pledged that "The PLO commits itself to the Middle East peace process and to a peaceful resolution of the conflict between the two states and declares that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations."

□ 1245

Clearly, if Arafat plans to declare as his own land that belongs to another country outside of the Oslo process, then he is inviting war upon the region. The President himself has suggested that such a move would be catastrophic, and Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Martin Indyk, warned in October of dire consequences of unilateral declaration of independence: In the process of the Palestinians seeking to assert the sovereignty of their so-called independent state and the Israelis seeking to deny it, a clash would seem inevitable. I can see a movement from a kind of declaration of independence to a war of independence that would be the absolute antithesis of the peace process.

Arafat has been planning for many months now to declare unilaterally a Palestinian State and reject the Oslo process. In late February, Arafat said we assure the whole world that the establishment of the independent state of Palestine with holy Jerusalem as its capital is a sacred and legitimate right of the Palestinian people. It is a goal that our people will not accept to advocate or to give up no matter what the difficulties and the challenges.

Other Palestinian leaders have been echoing Arafat's announcements. As recently as Sunday, this last Sunday, a senior adviser to Chairman Arafat said, quote, the Palestinian position is still

that May 4 is the fixed date on declaring statehood, but he also added that the Palestinian leadership will study all proposals and ideas. Another key Palestinian official said in late February that we are moving forward in our preparations for the day, May 4, the date of declaration of Palestinian state. More specifically, on September 24 Chairman Arafat's cabinet announced that at the end of the interim period the Palestinian authorities shall declare the establishment of the Palestinian state on all Palestinian land occupied since 1967, which Jerusalem is the eternal capital of the Palestinian state.

The provocative statements by Arafat and his ministers show that his intentions are real and imminent. However, Arafat knows that he cannot simply choose to declare another country's land as his own so he has been trying to gain the support of other countries. Arafat has already visited with leaders of several other countries including Muammar Kadafi, the terrorist leader of Libya, in his worldwide tour to gain acceptance. Arafat's courting of Kadafi should in itself make clear to the U.S. policymakers that a unilaterally-declared Palestinian state could result in the development of an alliance that is detrimental to the U.S. interests.

Let us also remember that Arafat supported Saddam Hussein during the Gulf War, and many Palestinian citizens took to the streets a few months ago to burn American flags in protest of America's bombing campaign of Iraqi military targets.

In any event, on March 23 Arafat will be visiting President Clinton to press the United States to support his move, and the United States must not succumb to his tactics. When President Clinton and the administration confront Arafat on this issue, they must be firm that the United States will never recognize a unilaterally-declared Palestinian state.

This is timely. I hope that we can receive cooperation. The bulk of the people in this body, Republican and Democrat, support this measure. Let us move forth in a good faith effort of bipartisanship to get this done.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have to rise in opposition to this resolution. There are several reasons why I think this further complicates the peace process.

For one, it does not condemn unilateral acts by both Israelis and Palestinians, but only the Palestinian authority. The House leadership brought it up under suspension of the rules, so there are no amendments that would make it a more balanced bill. The committee refused to consider an amendment that would have achieved that objective, and so the perception is going to be that we are acting in a biased, unbalanced manner even though our intelligence community, as the ranking

member of the Committee on International Relations has said, has reported that the Palestinian authority is doing everything it can right now to comply with the Oslo requirements.

We are in a terribly delicate situation. I do not think that it is in anyone's interest to declare a Palestinian state on May 4. For one thing, it plays into the hands of the right wing elements in Israeli politics with elections occurring in 2 weeks. For another thing, it means that Mr. Arafat is going to find it much more difficult not to declare Palestinian statehood because it is going to look as though he is bowing to the pressures of the American political system. That is not in our interests.

Mr. Arafat is our best hope right now, like it or not, for advancing the peace process. We all have a stake in advancing the peace process. If Mr. Arafat goes, who knows who will take control of the Palestinian community? The likelihood is that it will be someone far more radical and extreme. We have lost King Hussein, a leader of the peace process; we lost Mr. Rabin. We cannot afford to lose a Palestinian leader who is now fully invested in bringing about a successful conclusion to the Mideast peace process.

Mr. Speaker, I do not disagree with the sponsor of this resolution or the chairman of the committee who I know want the peace process to succeed, but I do disagree with their judgment that this is constructive. I do not think it is constructive. I do not think that the resolution that we passed in June of 1997, even though that also was non-binding, was constructive. In fact, it led to riots, it led to people being killed. The actions that we take have real consequence, even though they may be nonbinding. The only hope for peace to succeed is that we be an unbiased, balanced broker for peace in the Middle East. It is particularly important right now that we sustain that principled effort and not bow to domestic political considerations.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, over the past several months Chairman Yasser Arafat has repeatedly threatened to unilaterally declare a Palestinian state in the West Bank on the Gaza Strip with, of course, East Jerusalem as its capital. We cannot recognize any such declaration, and we urge Mr. Arafat not to pursue this reckless course. Such a declaration will have a destabilizing effect on the Middle East and will render the Oslo Accords and the Wye agreements meaningless.

Recently, however, Mr. Arafat suggested a PA confederation with Jordan. Perhaps that could be subject to negotiation, but only after Mr. Arafat and the PA have concluded successfully the promises that they have already made.

For example, first, Mr. Arafat and the PA must reduce the size of the Palestinian authority to the agreed upon level so that it does not violate the Oslo Accords.

Second, Mr. Arafat and the PA must end all PA-run incitement of violence, and anti-Semitism, and vilification of Jews and make meaningful reconciliation between Jews and Arabs a real possibility.

Third, Mr. Arafat and the PA must renounce the validity of the right of return, a policy which by definition challenges the viability of the state of Israel even after Palestinian independence.

Fourth, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Arafat and the PA should renounce and cut off ongoing ties to terrorists. Their insistence on releasing terrorists who plan acts of terror and provide the wherewithal to commit such acts must come to an end.

And fifth, Mr. Arafat and the PA must establish modes of economic transparency and accountability relative to foreign aid received by them, thus preventing endemic corruption and theft currently plaguing the very structure of the Palestinian authority.

Among the many disturbing incidences noted in Point 2 is the PA-run anti-Semitic incitement mainly to children via textbooks, newspapers and television and radio programs. The PA through international anti-Semitic rhetoric, even in school books, is attempting to raise Palestinian children with a deep rooted hatred toward Israel and Jews.

Simply put, the PA and Yasser Arafat are subverting the peace agreements signed and perpetuating hostile feelings toward Israel and ultimately brainwashing Palestinian children. Therefore, I conclude by saying I support H. Con. Res. 24 and continue to oppose the creation of a Palestinian state on a unilateral basis.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL).

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

For 50 years and more my dad and I have supported two things: The rights and the freedoms of Israel and the cause of peace in the Middle East. I do not believe the action that we are taking today is furthering either of those goals. What we are doing is rejecting an evenhanded, honest broker approach to peace in the Middle East and substituting for that a participation in and invective directed at only one side. There is fault aplenty in the Middle East, but I do not believe that a honest broker should spend his or her time engaged in the finding or the charging of that fault. Clearly here we are breaching that rule.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to reject this resolution. It is not in our interests, it is not in the interests of the Palestinians, and it is not in the interests of the Israelis. It is

clearly not in the interests of peace. We best serve our own interests by working for peace and by seeing to it that all parties are aware of the fact that that is our sole and only goal in this matter. We are breaching that rule.

I would urge my colleagues to keep in mind the fact that there is plenty that this country can do which will have much more beneficial effect on the cause of peace. We can work to see that both sides honor the Wye Accord and the Oslo commitments. That is not being done, nor is it being furthered here, and I would admit that there is fault again on both sides. But that fault is not to be judged by us, if we are to be honest brokers in the cause of peace. Rather, it should be the effort of this country to see to it that we bring the parties together to negotiate in an honest and an open and as friendly a fashion as we can arrange. Clearly that is not being accomplished here.

I am not here to take sides with the Israelis, nor am I here to take sides with the Palestinians. I am here to say that what we are doing here is wrong, it is not in the interests of this country, nor is it in the interests of the cause of peace.

I would observe that it is very easy to start a war in an area like the Middle East where tensions and passions are high. It is very, very hard to stop. This country has invested hundreds of billions of dollars in peace in the Middle East. Do we want to reject it by the adoption of a resolution which does nothing of good and which very probably is going to contribute much mischief and much evil to an already overheated area where tensions are high and where the peace process is not prospering.

I would urge my colleagues to reject this resolution, to support measures which will put us in the position of being, as the United States, honestly concerned about peace in the area, in the position where we are leading both parties towards peace and towards an honest negotiation. This peace is not going to be resolved by invective. It will be resolved by all working together and by the leadership of the United States in the cause of peace.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, since there are a number of Members seeking recognition on this issue, I ask unanimous consent that the time for debate be extended by 20 minutes on each side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding this time to me particularly because he knows that I oppose this resolution, yet in his graciousness offers me the time to speak my mind. For that I am most grateful.

This is the wrong time for this resolution. Why? Because there is an election pending in Israel. This resolution, although not necessarily so intended, will unavoidably have an effect on that election in Israel, and here is why.

First of all, the resolution itself does not criticize any potential unilateral action on the Israeli side. Part of the debate in the Israeli political elections right now is the record of the Likud government, to bring about successful peace negotiations.

□ 1300

For this resolution, therefore, to have no criticism at all, no comment at all, about threatened unilateral actions which would jeopardize that peace process on the Likud side, plays into one side in that political battle. It supports Likud's characterization of the negotiations over that of Labor.

Secondly, the mere fact that we are considering the resolution at this time influences the Israeli elections. I believe it is fair to say that the Likud government has argued that one of their advantages, which they present to the Israeli electorate, is that they are singularly able to have influence in the halls of Congress. The fact that we are taking this resolution up now, with the election pending, plays to that perception. It is a mistake; nevertheless, that would be the perception, and so the timing is wrong.

Accordingly, I would urge my colleagues who cannot vote no to vote present as a way of saying that whether or not the matter is appropriate, it is not appropriate at this time.

Lastly, I intend to vote no because I believe that the people of Palestine are entitled to their own country. That does not mean that they can threaten Israel. It does not mean that they will practically have a country until they reach an accommodation with Israel. I strongly strongly stand for the right of Israel to be free, secure and safe. All of that must be negotiated.

But to the child born in a refugee camp who has never known a home except a refugee camp, to the child born in Gaza whose parents go up to work through a chute, as though a cattle chute, every day into Israel, to the resident of the West Bank who cannot carry on the trade with Jordan, I say you have a country; and you have the right to say you do. Everything else is subject to negotiation.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the minority whip.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, all of us hope and pray for a just and a lasting peace in the Middle East. The question that we face today is how can we best achieve that? What can the United States do to encourage both sides, the Israelis and the Palestinians alike, to overcome years of suspicion and sorrow and anger and disappointment? How can we hope to move the peace process forward?

I regret to say that I come to the conclusion that this resolution takes us in the wrong direction. I join my previous two colleagues, the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) in that view. It is, I believe, a one-sided resolution that will only set things back. If it passes, I think it risks undermining our credibility. It risks frustrating our progress and, indeed, I think it risks postponing peace.

If this House is to take a position on the peace process, I think what we ought to do is tell both sides that they ought to live by the agreement that they have made, to abide by the agreement that they have made.

Choosing sides now, and that is what the resolution does, I believe, is short-sighted. There is, as we know, an election going on in Israel and there is a great deal of anxiety and a great deal of tension in the Palestinian community. Lives are literally hanging in the balance. What we do today could have enormous implications for that peace process, and I think the United States should do everything it can to remain a firm, neutral arbiter in this ongoing process.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond to a couple of the things that have been said on the other side. First of all, I think as the debate goes forward we will see clearly that this is a bipartisan measure. It looks as though it is becoming a polarization between the Republicans and the Democrats with the Republicans favoring this measure and the Democrats not. Nothing could be further from this truth. In fact, we have well over 280 cosponsors, 100 of those Democrat Members, courageous Members, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), many, many, congressmen on the other side, who believe that this is an idea that will strengthen the peace process and not harm it.

I also might suggest there have been those who have said suggest that this might be irresponsible, not well timed, would harm the peace process. I might remind Members that just a few short days ago, 98 members of the Senate and one against voted for this exact same measure word for word, and I really think that it is getting kind of a misrepresentation today as something that is kind of out there on the limb when really it is not. It is a very responsible measure.

I might also say that it is intended to protect the peace process because if the Palestinian Authority did declare unilateral statehood it is tantamount to war, and the consequences would be extremely dire.

To my knowledge, the Israelis have not proposed any unilateral measure outside of the negotiations, and so if they had proposed and if anybody on the other side can come up with just

one unilateral action that the Israelis have proposed that is outside of the Oslo Accord, please bring it forward and we will add it to a resolution and bring it up next week.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES).

(Mr. FORBES asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for his leadership on this question.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, we are here today contemplating passage of this most necessary resolution because of the public pronouncements of Yasser Arafat. He has necessitated this action because in direct contravention of the Wye and Oslo agreements, he has put out there the notion that he may, in fact, declare unilaterally a Palestinian state. If there is ever an act that would sabotage the hopes for peace and security in the region, it would be that unilateral declaration.

Yasser Arafat unquestionably remains, in fact, a professional terrorist. He has American, Israeli, European and Arab blood on his hands. There are many of his allies, the Hezbollah and the Hamas, who consider themselves close allies, who would like nothing better than a declaration of independence by Yasser Arafat sometime in May. It would give them the opportunity to have a state that is fully sovereign and inviolable; able to import and manufacture any weapon; turn a police force that in all reality is actually an army into what we know it to be; free to support terrorism and poised to attack Israel and possibly Jordan.

From his past actions, we can only infer that a unilateral declaration by Yasser Arafat would be absolutely the matter that would destroy the process for peace and security in the region. Therefore, we are obligated, as a nation who has been an honest broker in this process, to bring this resolution forward and to state for all the world that we will not stand for a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state that would really lead, frankly, to the compromising of the security and the safety and the peaceful coexistence of Israel.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this resolution is going to pass overwhelmingly today. No one has argued, after all, that a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state is a helpful idea, especially in light of the precarious state of the peace process and the impending Israeli elections.

The resolution, moreover, has been redrawn since the last Congress, to clarify that it opposes the unilateral declaration of Palestinian statehood, not Palestinian statehood as such.

The most promising path to peace, most of us agree, and the most promising path to the satisfaction of both Palestinian and Israeli aspirations, is to have no provocative unilateral actions taken by either side but, rather, to continue the process of negotiation and cooperation mapped out in Oslo.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I must add that both the timing and the content of this resolution give cause for great concern.

The resolution is one-sided in focusing its attention on what the Palestinians need to do to promote the peace process with no attention to Israeli obligations stemming from the Oslo and the Wye Accords.

The Oslo agreement signified that the Israelis and Palestinians have become partners on the road to peace and both sides must live up to their obligations and avoid provocations that undermine the peace process.

The ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), proposed language in committee that would have made this a more balanced resolution, asserting United States opposition to "a unilateral declaration of statehood or unilateral actions by either party outside the negotiating process that prejudice or predetermine those negotiations."

Israel has been and remains our strongest and most reliable ally in the Middle East. Declaring as part of this resolution that they too must be responsible for carrying out their obligations would not undermine our relationship or threaten its future. In fact, it might make it stronger.

Mr. Speaker, I hope and believe that Chairman Arafat has no intention of declaring statehood unilaterally, despite the arrival of the deadline date anticipated at Oslo. Our administration has already made it abundantly clear that it is opposed to a unilateral declaration of statehood. No one doubts that.

So why are we considering this resolution now? And will this resolution make it harder or easier, politically, for Chairman Arafat to do the right thing?

I think I know the answers to these questions, and I wish the sponsors of this resolution had conscientiously thought them through before bringing this resolution to the floor today.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY).

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) and I want to underscore once again the United States Senate, in a vote of 98-to-1, passed the exact same resolution, the exact same resolution word for word.

We oppose the PLO's unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, despite the First Lady's claim that there should be one. Many in the PLO leadership seem to think that the final word

on a Palestinian state will come from the PLO and no one else. Well that assumption cannot be more wrong.

I will remind Mr. Arafat that unilateral action violates the basic provisions of the Oslo peace process. I will also remind Mr. Arafat that since the Oslo peace agreement was signed in 1993, the U.S. has provided hundreds of millions of dollars in aid to the Palestinian Authority for maintaining its commitment to bring peace to the Middle East.

I have always been skeptical of that commitment, and if the PLO moves toward unilateral declaration of statehood it will prove to the world what I have always suspected, the PLO is committed to rhetoric, not peace.

Mr. Arafat, the U.S. Congress is putting you on notice, declare statehood on May 4 and we will declare your financial support from the U.S. null and void.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN).

(Mr. ROTHMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for his bill.

Mr. Speaker, which country is America's greatest ally in the Middle East? Which country votes with the United States 95 percent of the time at the United Nations, more so than any other American ally? Which country allows U.S. planes to fly over her airspace? Which country cares for America's soldiers and her hospitals and is our partner in developing a missile defense system? Who is the Middle East's only democracy and the longest and best ally of the United States?

Israel.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution pending before this body right now is very simple. It simply reaffirms America's commitments to both her number one ally in the Middle East, Israel, and to the peace process that began with the signing of the Oslo Accords in 1993.

Palestinian threats to unilaterally declare statehood is a violation of the Oslo Accords that they signed. A unilaterally declared Palestinian state, without borders agreed upon by the state of Israel, would take Israeli land, would threaten Israel's people and would, yes, threaten Israel's very existence.

America, and the United States Congress, must be very clear to the Palestinian Authority. When you wrongfully threaten America's best and most strategic ally in the Middle East and one of America's greatest allies in the world, there will be immediate, lasting and severe consequences.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, the United States must not recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS).

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House concurrent resolution 24 expressing this Congress's opposition to a unilateral declaration of an independent Palestinian state.

Mr. Speaker, peace in the Middle East cannot be achieved through unilateral declarations. A lasting peace can and will only be achieved at the bargaining table, through the give and take of diplomacy and negotiation.

PLO leader Yasser Arafat's repeated assertions that he would declare a Palestinian state on or after May 4, 1999, are both an affront to and a violation of the spirit of the Oslo Accords, threatening not only a delicate peace process, but an escalation of violence and bloodshed.

Palestinian statehood is a fundamental issue in the Arab-Israeli negotiations and one that needs to be addressed through deliberation and consensus, not posturing and proclamation. America's response to these declarations must be certain and unambiguous: That we oppose any and all arbitrary declarations of statehood, and would not under any circumstances recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state.

When President Clinton meets next week with Yasser Arafat, he must repeat this Congress's and this Nation's resolve that any Palestinian state must be created at the bargaining table.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN).

(Mr. BERMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to give my prepared remarks; I would rather at this point take a little time to respond to some of the comments that have been raised on this issue, because I think that the resolution of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) has received a bit of an unfair rap.

This is not a resolution to catalog all of the violations that have occurred by one party or another and to make an accurate statement of who has been wronged and who has not been wronged. It is not about the past, it is about the future. I say most respectfully, when I hear the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) say, I want to see a Palestinian state, my guess is, if asked, the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES), would say, I never want to see a Palestinian state. I think what the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL) wants and what the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) wants or what I want is irrelevant.

The parties agreed at Oslo to decide this most fundamental of issues: the negotiations over what kind of entity will be there in the final status talks and negotiations between the parties. It is not a U.S. decision, and it is not a Members of Congress decision.

Mr. Speaker, all this resolution does is say, Congress opposes in every way it can such a fundamental and material breach of the Oslo process as the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state. If the Israeli cabinet and the Israeli Knesset announced tomorrow that they were going to annex every portion of the West Bank now under Israeli military occupation, which is the vast, vast majority of the West Bank, people would say, wait a second, you are fundamentally breaching the commitments you made under Oslo, and they would be accurate in saying so. This is the exact equivalent. However, no one in responsible positions in Israel has suggested annexation, a unilateral annexation, except in retaliation for the declaration of statehood; but on the Palestinian side, a number of leaders under the Palestinian Authority have threatened the unilateral declaration.

So I can sit here and talk about whether enough guns have been confiscated by the Palestinian Authority or whether terrorists have been released or what is the state of Israel's settlements, and I have opinions on all of those different issues. This is not a resolution to catalog all of those questions; this is a resolution that goes to the heart of the breach that will destroy the peace process, and that is unilateral declaration of statehood.

One final point. There is a lot of talk here about U.S. as honest broker, U.S. as evenhanded. Let me tell my colleagues, the Palestinians, Chairman Arafat, the leadership of the Palestinian Authority, wants the U.S. involved in the peace process because of the U.S.'s relationship with the State of Israel, because the U.S. has been Israel's strongest ally, because Israel has come to the U.S.

The U.S. role, yes, is to be an honest broker and to play a facilitating role and to bring the parties together and to push the peace process forward. But make no mistake about it. If parties wanted evenhanded, neutral people who have demonstrated equal distance from all of the parties, they could have gone to the Swedes or Norway or to the European Union to play this role. No. The Palestinian Authority recognizes that it is the U.S. and its relationship with Israel, close as it is, that makes it a useful party to help facilitate these talks. It is not for the U.S. to be evenhanded; it is for the U.S. to recognize its relationship with Israel and to play that kind of a role, and that is the way this process will succeed, with the United States playing that role.

So I commend the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON). I think this is a good resolution. This recognizes that a fundamental breach might very well occur and we should right now let everyone know that this destroys the peace process and we think it is a big mistake, and on the other issues, let us work to resolve them and move that process forward.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 24, expressing congressional opposition

to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state.

The most basic and fundamental principle of the Middle East peace process is that all issues related to the permanent status of a Palestinian entity must be addressed through negotiations.

A unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state would, by definition, constitute a blatant violation of that principle and fly in the face of Palestinian commitments under the Oslo accords.

Palestinian statehood—more than any other issue—goes right to the core of the Arab-Israeli conflict. One side cannot act alone in determining this status and in answering the numerous questions that it raises: Where should its borders be? What should be the limitations on its sovereignty? How will Israel's security be guaranteed?

A unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state would destroy the peace process. Years of hard work, sacrifice and efforts to build trust would go down the drain in the blink of an eye. There would be no winners, only losers.

As Prime Minister Netanyahu recently stated, Israel would respond "very forcefully" if such a declaration were made. This response would probably include an Israeli decision to annex portions of the West Bank currently under their control.

Although you wouldn't know it from reading the text of this resolution, President Clinton has repeatedly declared strong opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and made it abundantly clear that it would not be recognized by the United States.

Nevertheless, Palestinian Authority Chairman Yassar Arafat has refused to rule out the possibility.

As recently as February 20, a high level Palestinian Authority official said, and I quote, "We are moving forward in our preparations for the day, May 4, the date of the declaration of a Palestinian state."

So, as much as I'd like to believe the conventional wisdom that Chairman Arafat will not make a unilateral declaration of statehood, it is clear that we as a body must go on record to express our complete and total opposition to such an act.

I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 24.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT).

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding to me. I stand in support of his resolution.

I also want to associate myself with the comments just made by the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN). I think that was an excellent analysis of the delicacy of the decisions that are going to be made in the next few weeks.

The repeated threats to unilaterally declare a Palestinian state are as unstabilizing, as destabilizing, as unsettling as anything could be in this process. That action is in violation of the agreement as I see it. Article XXXI of the Oslo II Accords clearly states, "Neither side shall initiate or take any step that will change the status of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip pending the outcome of permanent status negotiations."

Obviously, this is at the heart of the outcome of those negotiations. Obviously, this is a core issue that more than any other can provide great imbalance at a time when the Middle East has at least within sight the opportunity for peace, the opportunity for balance there.

Mr. Speaker, our response to what the Palestinians might do would be crucial. Chairman Arafat's understanding of our response is crucial. We need to make it clear that we will not recognize a unilaterally declared State; that the peace process would be in jeopardy; that the United States will do its best to help mediate this conflict, to help ensure permanent peace, but that the timing could not be worse than the timing that is projected to declare this state, a timing only days before an election in Israel. Elections are volatile times anywhere. They are most volatile in the Middle East; they are most volatile in Israel. The debate is a difficult debate to achieve. It is particularly difficult to achieve in the middle of an election campaign.

Mr. Speaker, our message to Chairman Arafat should be, do not take this step, do not jeopardize the process. Do everything you can to stabilize the situation with Israel. Our message to Israel should be to work hard for peace.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS).

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight and to argue that support for this resolution is the single-most helpful thing we can do for Yassar Arafat to continue the peace process.

In recent months, I had occasion 3 times to discuss with Mr. Arafat and his associates this issue. Last summer, then Speaker Gingrich and Democratic Leader Gephardt led a small group of us to the area for discussions. Last December, the President went with a few of us to talk to both sides and we spent considerable time with Mr. Arafat discussing this issue.

Earlier this year, I had the privilege of addressing the Palestinian National Council, along with Former Prime Minister Peres and the former head of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev. My message on all three occasions was very simple: A unilateral declaration of statehood by Arafat would permanently destroy the peace process. Let me repeat that. If Arafat goes ahead with a unilateral declaration of statehood, whether it is on May 4 or May 25, or July 11, the peace process is over.

Let me say to some of my colleagues, some on my side of the aisle who are straining for equivalence, the equivalence would be to call on Israel, not to unilaterally declare statehood. Israel has been a State for over 50 years, an ally of the United States, a member of the United Nations with diplomatic representation all over the world. There is no equivalence here, because the two sides are not equivalent. We

are talking about a unique historic situation whereby a sovereign and independent state is in the process of voluntarily negotiating the surrender of territories it occupies, and possibly negotiating the creation by mutual consent of another state.

Now, some have belittled this resolution as being not binding. Well, it may not be binding, but it surely has consequences. Let me state here and now so that there will not be any question or doubt about it, that if Arafat does declare unilaterally a Palestinian state, I intend to introduce legislation in this body which will cut off all aid to the Palestinian Authority instantaneously. So this is not an academic debate. Should it be necessary to introduce such legislation, it will pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. Speaker, some think that since there have been technical violations on both sides of the Oslo Accords, we should discuss all of those. I think it is extremely important to realize that obviously there will be charges of technical violations of an incredibly complex, life and death agreement that might eventually solve this long-simmering crisis. But we are not talking about little technical violations. A unilateral declaration of state by Arafat terminates the peace process.

Since I am passionately committed to the peace process for the sake of the Palestinian people, for the sake of the Israeli people, for the whole region and indeed, for global stability, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. It is a carefully crafted, balanced, reasonable resolution, the purpose of which is to save Arafat from the hot-heads in his own camp. There are people within Arafat's group who are pushing him for a unilateral declaration of state. If he follows their advice, the peace process is doomed.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this resolution. I commend my friend, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for introducing it.

□ 1330

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my strong support for this legislation which expresses congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state and urges the President to assert clearly United States opposition to such unilateral declaration of statehood.

Mr. Speaker, Yassar Arafat's repeated threats that he would unilaterally declare a Palestinian state on May 4, 1999 are a grievous violation of the spirit of the Oslo Accords. At the heart of the peace process lies the fundamental commitment that all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.

In breach of this central obligation, Mr. Arafat is asserting that he can preempt the negotiations and act unilaterally on the critical and crucial issue of

statehood. While Israel has committed itself to continuous negotiations to resolve all issues, Mr. Arafat's threat is imperiling the peace process.

Clearly a unilateral declaration of statehood would violate the very principles on which the Oslo Peace Accords are based, and such an action would without question trigger a cycle of retaliation and escalation, possibly leading to violence and perhaps a collapse of the peace process itself.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation, and I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be the lead Democrat on this resolution, and I want to thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for his leadership in sponsoring this resolution.

As the gentleman from Arizona said before, this is a bipartisan resolution. It has 280 cosponsors, which is a majority of this House. What this does is simply bring Congress in line with what has been said many, many times before by President Clinton, by the administration, and by anyone who is in the know about the Middle East, that a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state destroys the peace process. Clear and simple.

So if we want the peace process to continue, then there ought to be no unilateral declarations of any kind. If we want to destroy the peace process, then Mr. Arafat can go right ahead and issue his unilateral declaration.

Some of my colleagues have said this will influence the Israeli elections. That is nonsense, because every mainstream party in Israel, every candidate for prime minister in Israel who is in the mainstream is opposed to a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state. So this will not affect the Israeli elections. It simply holds Mr. Arafat's feet to the fire.

Now we know Mr. Arafat has a way of talking out of 32 sides of his mouth. We want him to keep his commitments. This is a very, very balanced resolution, and I want to read some of it. Simple. It says, "Whereas at the heart of the Oslo peace process lies the basic, irrevocable commitment made by Palestinian Chairman Yasser Arafat that, in his words, 'all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations.'" That is from Yasser Arafat's own mouth. Why would anyone be opposed to holding his feet to the fire on that?

The resolution further states, "Resolved by the House of Representatives * * * That (1) the final political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority can only be determined through negotiations and agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority." Who could oppose that?

"(2) any attempt to establish Palestinian statehood outside the negotiating process will invoke the strongest congressional opposition," as it will. Finally, "(3) the President should unequivocally assert United States opposition," which the President has, "to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, making clear that such a declaration would be a grievous violation of the Oslo accords and that a declared state would not be recognized by the United States."

If you ask me, this is again certainly a mainstream resolution. It has broad bipartisan support. It is only asking the parties to keep the commitments to which they made.

Mr. Arafat has to understand that there will be severe consequences if he does not fulfill his commitment, blowing up the peace process and a cut off of American aid. So, again, this is bipartisan. I strongly urge my colleagues to support it. I thank the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON) for his leadership.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), ranking Democrat and soon to be chairman again of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for this resolution because I am against all unilateral agencies in the Middle East. But do not kid ourselves by saying this is a balanced resolution. It is not. If it were, it would take note of all unilateral actions taken by all parties in the Middle East, including some unilateral actions taken by this very Congress.

I believe that there will be a Palestinian State someday, but I think it should be established through direct negotiations with Israel. I believe the United States will have an embassy in Jerusalem, but I believe it should be, again, at the end of the process because to attack precipitously will simply inflame the situation and make the peace process more difficult.

I also believe, however, if this Congress is going to be fair-minded in urging people like Mr. Arafat not to unilaterally declare a Palestinian State, and I agree he should not, then this Congress should also be fair-minded in noting the actions on the part of the Israeli government in taking unilateral actions with respect to some settlement activities in the West Bank and in the Jerusalem neighborhoods.

It just seems to me that if Congress wants to be constructive rather than simply political, that when it brings resolutions to the floor such as this, they ought to be more balanced than this is.

I say that as a friend of Israel. I say that as the person who, for 10 years, chaired the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs. During that time, that committee provided immense amounts of aid to Israel with my support.

But I think that, if Congress wants to help move the peace process forward, it

needs to be more balanced and more constructive than it usually is. This resolution I think, while it is correct in asking Mr. Arafat not to proceed, it is most certainly not correct to call it a balanced resolution because most definitely it is not.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SALMON), the sponsor of the resolution.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for yielding me this time. I might also congratulate the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY). I had no idea he was reregistering as a Republican, obviously, if he is going to be the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I think that is a great move.

I would also like to thank the people who have tirelessly worked on behalf of this resolution. I would like to thank on our side most of all the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) for his tireless efforts. He introduced the legislation last year and has been working on it for a long, long time.

I also owe a great debt of gratitude to the majority whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY) for making H. Con. Res. 24 a foreign policy priority in the 106th Congress.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the lead Democratic sponsor, has been an enormous help in moving the resolution forward. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) have also contributed both in front and behind the scenes.

Moreover, the help of the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES) and the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. BERKLEY) in gathering cosponsors is greatly appreciated. Last, I would really like to thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) for making this a priority of the Committee on International Relations and bringing it to the floor.

I think many have spoken about this resolution in ways that I think really do not grasp the essence of what we are trying to accomplish. But there have been a few that I think have very cogently delineated what exactly this bill does.

I think of the comments of the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) and I think of the comments of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ROTHMAN). They understand what this is all about.

What this is about is to strengthen the peace process. Many times here in the Congress we have tried to be ahead of the curve, not to cause problems, but to make sure that it is clear in the minds of those that we are negotiating with, that we deal with in good faith, that they are clear of our intentions.

I recall when we were dealing with China, and they started lobbying missiles in the Taiwan Strait, that Congress was very forceful in communicating to China what our intentions were

and what our relationship with Taiwan is and will be in the future.

Those statements were not harmful to our relationship with China. They were clear statements of a purpose, of what we stand for, of what we are about. As was mentioned, there is nothing in this resolution that denounces anything that the Palestinian Authority has done.

All it does is denounce what they might possibly do and let them know, with due process and clear intention, that if they declare unilaterally a Palestinian state, that the United States will not recognize that, end of story. There is no beating up on them. There is no beating our chests. It is simply a clear delineation of what we stand for and what we believe.

As far as the peace process is concerned, we are all committed. Those who have suggested that this might somehow thwart the peace process, I think they know better. I think that sometimes their rhetoric gets a little reckless and out of control, but, frankly, I think they know better.

They know what the intentions of this resolution are, and that is why it passed the Senate 98 to 1. That is why there are 280 cosponsors, because it is very plain, straightforward, and to the point.

It reiterates what the American people and the Congress have believed for a long, long time, and that is that the peace process cannot proceed if reckless action such as declaring unilaterally a Palestinian state goes forward.

As the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) aptly pointed out, it would completely obliterate, explode the peace process. That is not what we are about.

For those who have suggested the intentions are somewhat different, I ask them to please don their reading glasses and take another look at it, try a little harder to understand it. It is not that difficult.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution that we are considering today, which underscores three important and timely points: (1) The final political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority can only be determined through negotiations and agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority; (2) any attempt to establish Palestinian statehood outside the negotiating process will invoke the strongest congressional opposition; and (3) the President should unequivocally assert United States opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, making clear that such a declaration would be a grievous violation of the Oslo Accords and that a declared state would not be recognized by the United States.

The resolution is forward thinking. Its intention is to prevent bloodshed. The Palestinian Authority must understand that it cannot break away from peaceful negotiations and receive support and recognition from the United States.

Before I close, I would like to thank Representative SAXTON for all of his work on this effort. And I owe a debt of gratitude to the Majority Whip, TOM DELAY, for making H. Con.

Res. 24 a foreign policy priority in the 106th Congress. The lead Democratic cosponsor, Representative ELIOT ENGEL, has been an enormous help in moving the resolution forward. Representatives ROTHMAN and SHERMAN have also contributed both in front and behind the scenes. Moreover, the help of Representatives FORBES and BERKLEY in gathering cosponsors is greatly appreciated. And lastly, I thank Chairman GILMAN for his commitment to bring this resolution to the floor.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 24.

This resolution was introduced barely six weeks ago to make clear the United States' position on the Middle East peace process.

Today, this resolution will send a clear signal to Palestinian and other Middle East leaders that this government remains unified on two things.

First, we unconditionally support the Middle East peace process and the agreements that have been entered into by the Palestinians, Israelis and other nations.

Second, we stand firmly and unconditionally opposed to actions that either undermine the peace process or contradict the Oslo or Wye agreements.

A unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state will only lead to turmoil and destabilize the peace process.

The recent passing of King Hussein of Jordan combined with the upcoming election in Israel places the already fragile peace agreement on even shakier ground.

That is why it is imperative for all parties, including the United States, to redouble their commitment to a fair and lasting peace.

Again, I am pleased to support this resolution because I believe it clearly and fairly reinforces our support for peace in the Middle East.

Mr. LAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H. Con. Res. 24 expressing the House's opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, and urging the President to clearly state that the United States government is united in its opposition to such a move—one that would certainly destabilize the Middle East peace process.

Several critical points must be understood. First, it is Palestinian Authority chairman Yasir Arafat who has suggested that he might unilaterally declare a free and independent Palestinian state on May 4th of this year. This unilateral step would contravene the entire process that was set in motion by the Oslo Accords and confirmed in the Wye River Memorandum. The fundamental premise of this process is one that Yasir Arafat himself recognized in a letter to Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin years ago where he wrote that: "all outstanding issues relating to the permanent status will be resolved through negotiations." The threatened unilateral declaration of statehood flies in the face of this understanding and resorts to one side taking matters into its own hands. It is thus a violation of commitments made at Oslo and Wye.

Second, such a step would certainly destabilize the peace process and serve as a catalyst for violence in Israel and in those areas already governed by the Palestinian Authority. Effectively, therefore, a unilateral declaration by the Palestinian Authority could be interpreted as a threat of violence. This too flies in the face of the tenets of the peace process and calls into question Mr. Arafat's trustworthiness as a negotiating partner.

Third, while some have suggested that this resolution should also call upon Israel as well to avoid unilateral actions that might be questioned under the Oslo framework, such an inclusion would lack any balance and proportionality. Israel has not threatened to abdicate its commitments and unilaterally determine a final status issue of the magnitude of Palestinian statehood.

Fourth, the United States Congress has supported the Oslo process and the position that the parties themselves must resolve such thorny issues through negotiation. The United States Senate has remained true to this position by passing its resolution on this matter last week by a vote of 98 to 1. The House must do the same today. And the entire Congress must thereby insist that the Administration support resolving any permanent status issues through negotiations and agreement, not by unilateral action. The Administration must clearly state that any unilateral declaration of statehood by the Palestinian Authority will not receive the recognition of the United States and that the Administration will encourage its allies not to afford it any recognition either.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Israel last December with the President as the designee of the Speaker of this House. On that trip and others, I have seen up-close the challenges that this tiny island of democracy in the Middle East confronts and the risks she has taken for peace. Today, Yasir Arafat suggests the Palestinians may abandon the peace process and unilaterally declare a Palestinian state; tomorrow, he will threaten to declare Jerusalem as its capital.

Mr. Speaker, we must stand with our friends when they are challenged, and today that means standing with Israel.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my concern over language utilized in H. Con. Res. 24. Although I supported the resolution, I feel that Congress did not have an adequate opportunity to more fully discuss all unilateral declarations by any party to the Middle East peace process, including those by the United States. I believe that final status issues should be subject to good faith negotiations by both sides.

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, as an original co-sponsor of H. Con. Res. 24, I rise in strong support of this resolution and urge its adoption.

This resolution not only opposes a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state, but also urges the President to make very clear the opposition of the United States to such unilateral action. A unilateral declaration would be brinkmanship of the most irresponsible kind, a provocative act that would force the State of Israel to respond and a direct affront to the spirit of the Oslo accords.

Only six years ago, at the Oslo accords, Israeli and Palestinian negotiators took significant steps towards achieving peace and stability in the Middle East. Oslo forged a commitment to cooperate and strive for a lasting peace through open and honest negotiations.

Unfortunately, the peace process is now seriously threatened by a repeated threat by Palestinian leaders to unilaterally declare statehood once the Oslo accords expire on May 4. Such a declaration would short circuit the peace process, roll back the progress that has been made and undermine the hard work of all those who want meaningful peace in the Middle East.

Both Israeli and Palestinian leaders made a commitment at Oslo to resolve differences through negotiation. As Chairman Arafat said himself in a letter to Prime Minister Rabin in 1993, "All outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations." Chairman Arafat must be held accountable to this promise. A unilateral declaration would terminate the negotiations and risk a needless, perilous escalation of this conflict. Such defiance would compel the State of Israel to respond to protect its security, likely leading to escalating conflict.

The people of the Middle East have lived with conflict, violence and bloodshed for too long. Now they have the opportunity to negotiate a permanent peace. This opportunity must not be sabotaged by a unilateral declaration. The Oslo peace process has presented a valuable opportunity for the people of the Middle East to begin healing the wounds of centuries of conflict and distrust. A unilateral declaration of statehood would reopen those old wounds and inevitably lead to more violence and bloodshed.

It is my hope that both Israel and the Palestinians will live up to their commitments in the Oslo accords. This resolution puts the Congress on record in support of negotiation, not brinkmanship and unilateral action. That is the right road to peace.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution expressing congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state. My support, however, is given with a degree of reluctance. I believe that the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state is in direct conflict with the spirit of the Oslo Accords and would be a fatal blow to the ongoing peace process. I hope that our Palestinian and Israeli friends will continue to work together through the negotiating process to come to resolution on the final status of Palestine.

Mr. Speaker, I am, however, disappointed with the one-sidedness of this resolution. I am disappointed that my colleagues on the International Relations Committee did not see fit to amend the resolution as my colleague Mr. Gejdenson proposed. He asked that the resolution reflect the positive efforts made thus far by both parties to the negotiations and acknowledged that unilateral actions of any kind by either party are contrary to the spirit of negotiation. I wholeheartedly agree. Though I will vote in favor of this resolution, it is my hope that in the future this body keep in mind the necessity of fairmindedness in language and treatment for all parties in the Middle East working to find resolution to these extremely sensitive, contentious issues.

In a recent editorial to the Washington Post, Dr. Henry Kissinger noted that the role of the United States in the peace process is to help each party find terms that meet their own needs and yet are compatible with the necessities of the other. "As keepers of the diplomatic process, we should be steering the parties to a realistic dialogue on those subjects on which the survival of both sides truly depends." Today, we are sending a strong message to the Palestinian Authority not to take irrevocable action for which serious consequences will result. However, by condemning unilateral action by only one party to the negotiation, I believe we fail to meet our obligation to help the parties raise the dialogue to a higher level.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution. A unilateral declaration of statehood by the Palestinians would be a provocative act that would threaten the peace process. The President opposes such a declaration, and Congress should put its opposition on the record.

Both the Oslo Accord and the Wye Memorandum prohibit unilateral actions by either side. For years, it has been mutually understood that critical final status issues—prime among them the question of a Palestinian state—must be resolved in the context of direct negotiations between Israelis and Palestinians, not through unilateral actions.

My only problem with this resolution is that it is not strong enough. Congress should be on record opposing all unilateral acts, including, but not limited to, a declaration of Palestinian statehood. This resolution would be immeasurably strengthened if it opposed any and all unilateral actions by either party. In my view, Congress can do its part to advance the peace process by urging both parties to resist political temptations and refrain from unilateral actions.

Mr. Speaker, attaining peace in the Middle East is of paramount importance to U.S. national interests. The alternatives to a successful peace process are economic disruption, terrorism, and even war. The ability of future generations of Israelis and Palestinians to live in peace and enjoy economic prosperity depends on the peace process. The two main ingredients to continuing the peace process are active U.S. involvement and strict adherence to the historic agreements hammered out in Oslo and at Wye. This resolution urges one party to fulfill its commitment. In order to achieve peace, all parties must do their part.

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for the passage of H. Con. Res. 24 expressing the opposition of this Congress to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian State.

As you might remember, Mr. Speaker, five years ago Israel and the Palestinian Authority joined together in Oslo, Norway and signed the Oslo Accords as the first step towards a negotiated permanent peace accord. The Oslo Accords agreed to by both sides stated that any declaration of Palestinian Statehood must be the result of bilateral negotiation and mutually agreed security.

That being said, Chairman Arafat has announced on several occasions since Oslo his intentions to unilaterally declare an independent Palestinian state this May. Adding fuel to the fire have been the remarks last year of First Lady Hillary Clinton suggesting that a Palestinian State is in the best long term interest of the region, statements by officials at the State Department suggesting that the Palestinians should move forward and even President Clinton himself whose visit late last year to Gaza had all the pomp and circumstance of an official "state" visit.

While the Administration has expressed their opposition in recent weeks to a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian State, it is clear that Congress must now send Chairman Arafat a strong message in the absence once again of a clear and consistent Clinton Administration policy. Additionally, I am concerned that the Administration may be attempting to hold hostage U.S. assistance in the region due to Israel's reluctance to fully implement the Wye Agreement in response to Chairman

Arafat's intentions to unilaterally declare statehood. Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this once again shows the Administration's willingness to send the Palestinians the wrong message. It is my fear that if the Clinton Administration continues on this course, we risk blowing a hole in the peace process and permanently injuring the relationship we have with America's strongest ally in the region, Israel.

Throughout my first two terms in Congress I have invested a great deal of time helping to ensure that we can reach a negotiated peace in the Middle East. I have served as an international observer of the Palestinian Elections, Chairman of the House Republican Israel Caucus and have made several trips to the region. I know from my first hand experiences and meetings with leaders on both sides, that a lasting peace in this region can only be achieved through negotiation and agreement by both Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate has already acted on an identical resolution which passed by an overwhelming vote of 98 to 1. I urge my colleagues in the House to follow suit and send Chairman Arafat and the Clinton Administration a message that any declaration of a Palestinian State must be along the guidelines of the bilateral negotiations contained in the Oslo Accords.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution because we, as a nation, must make it unmistakably clear that a unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state by the Palestinian Authority is totally unacceptable.

The United States must never recognize a unilaterally declared Palestinian state. Such an act does nothing to further the peace process. It does, however, present a direct affront and challenge to Israel, one of our strongest allies.

A unilaterally declared Palestinian state would violate the most basic principles upon which the Middle East peace process has rested since the Oslo accords. Most importantly, it would dramatically destabilize the Middle East and increase the risk of renewed violence that could spell an end to the Middle East peace process.

A unilateral action by one party would allow this situation to snowball out of control. Too many people of good will have worked for too long trying to address these issues. We must make it clear that the Palestinian Authority must not abandon its commitments.

The interests of the United States require political, economic and social stability in the Middle East; the long-suffering people of the region deserve true peace. Yet clearly, we cannot impose a solution on the parties. Only Israel and the Palestinians—together—can forge a mutually acceptable solution to these difficult issues. The United States must continue to do everything in its power to assure that the parties to the negotiations stay the course.

As the resolution properly notes, Palestinian Authority Chairman Arafat, at Oslo, made a basic irrevocable commitment that "all outstanding issues relating to permanent status will be resolved through negotiations." The final political status of the territory controlled by the Palestinian Authority can only be determined through negotiations and agreement between Israel and the Palestinian Authority.

Chairman Arafat and the Palestinian Authority made an agreement with Israel that these issues would be resolved through negotiations, not through unilateral declarations. Just

as Israel agreed to a process for resolving these issues, so did the Palestinians. Both Israel and the Palestinian Authority must honor their agreements.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution.

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my views on H. Con. Res. 24, a resolution expressing Congressional opposition to the unilateral declaration of a Palestinian state.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose any unilateral action, by any of the parties to the Oslo Agreement and the Wye River Agreement that would endanger further progress in the Middle East peace process. I agree with the many observers who believe that for the Palestinian authority to declare a Palestinian state, at this time, would be disruptive and dangerous for the Middle East peace process. Such a unilateral declaration could also have a negative impact on the upcoming elections in Israel. While the Palestinian people do have the right of self determination, the declaration and establishment of a Palestinian state is an issue best dealt with in the context of a negotiated, comprehensive peace agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I also agree with the remarks of Mr. Dennis Ross, President Clinton's chief Middle East peace negotiator, regarding the negative impact on the peace process of the current Israeli government's continued push to build and expand Israeli settlements on the West Bank. Such settlement activity not only creates "new facts on the ground" but they create real obstacles to the completion of a fair and enduring peace between the Israelis and the Palestinian people.

Mr. Speaker, I will support this resolution today. However, I continue to urge both sides, the Palestinians and the Israelis, to avoid any unilateral actions which could endanger the Middle East peace process. We need to build more progress towards a peaceful solution, not more obstacles thrown in the path of peace.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of H. Con. Res. 24, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Since the United States officially recognized the state of Israel on May 15, 1948, we have enjoyed a close diplomatic relationship. As the only democracy in the Middle East, Israel has been a strong ally in this often tumultuous region and, in turn, the United States has provided necessary foreign aid. Without the strong support of our allies, including Israel, it is certain that long lasting peace would be far more difficult to achieve in the Middle East.

In the summer of 1997, I accompanied a congressional delegation to Israel to obtain a better understanding of the many important and delicate issues in the Middle East and to discuss the latest developments in the peace process. It is my belief that in order to secure U.S. interests in the Middle East, we must help ensure economic and political stability in Israel as well.

This past fall, President Clinton, Prime Minister Netanyahu, and Chairman Arafat met at the Wye River Plantation and reaffirmed the importance of maintaining a peace in the Middle East. The agreement struck at the Wye Plantation in October underscored the fact that both Israel and Palestine have to work together to form an enduring peace.

If Palestine unilaterally were to declare itself an independent state it could jeopardize the foundation upon which the Oslo Accords, the

Hebron Agreement, and the Wye Agreement were built. Mr. Speaker, it is imperative that any changes regarding "statehood" are done through the negotiating process, as stated in H. Con. Res. 24.

It is my hope that a lasting peace will soon be attained in the Middle East. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests of time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 24.

The question was taken.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 104 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 104

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 819) to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2000 and 2001. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chairman of the Committee of the Whole may accord priority in recognition on the basis of whether the Member offering an amendment has caused it to be printed in the portion of the Congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 8 of rule XVIII. Amendments so printed shall be considered as read. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole may: (1) postpone until a time during further consideration in the Committee of the Whole a request for a recorded vote on any amendment; and (2) reduce to five minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on any postponed question that follows another electronic vote without intervening business, provided that the minimum time for electronic voting on the first in any series of questions shall be 15 minutes. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

□ 1345

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOAKLEY), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday the Committee on Rules met and granted an open rule for H.R. 81, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act. The rule provides for 1 hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

The rule provides that the bill shall be open for amendment at any point and authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have preprinted their amendments in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce votes to 5 minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a 15-minute vote.

Finally, the rule provides for one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 104 is an open rule for a good, noncontroversial bill. The Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act allocates \$15.7 million for the Federal Maritime Commission in 2000 and \$16.3 million for the Commission in 2001, an increase of approximately \$1 million.

Because the Commission ably protects United States shippers and carriers, including Sea-Land Service of Charlotte, North Carolina, from the unfair trade practices of foreign governments and flag carriers, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure reported a bill that makes no changes to the duties of the Commission. I urge my colleagues to support this open rule and to support the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, my dear friend, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. MYRICK), for yielding me the customary half-hour, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, like every other Member of this House, I am a big fan of the Federal Maritime Commission. It protects United States shippers from the restrictive rules of foreign governments and from the unfair practices of foreign flagged carriers. It investigates complaints and helps keep shippers in compliance with the Shipping Act of 1984. It also monitors tariffs to make sure they are reasonable.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Maritime Commission keeps order on

the high seas, especially when it comes to commerce. The commissioners do very good work, and their work should continue.

I support this open rule and the bill to fund the Federal Maritime Commission in fiscal years 2000 and 2001. However, Mr. Speaker, let me note that I do not think that this bill even needs a rule at all.

The Federal Maritime Commission has such widespread support that, once upon a time, this bill was on the suspension calendar. I know of no amendments to this bill, so I am wondering why we are bringing the bill up with a rule in the first place.

Mr. Speaker, this is starting to become a pattern. Bills that normally come up under suspension of the rules are instead being sent to the Committee on Rules and coming to the floor for a vote. In fact, 9 of the last 15 bills that we have sent to the Committee on Rules have passed by more than 400 votes.

On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, the bills that should have open rules are being closed down. We just finished the Ed-Flex bill, which was brought to the floor under a restrictive rule with a preprinting requirement and a time cap. Twenty-three Democratic amendments were submitted and preprinted; two Republican amendments were submitted and preprinted. Both Republican amendments were considered and only three of the 23 Democratic amendments were considered before the time cap was up.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, 20 Democratic amendments which were preprinted in the RECORD, according to the rule, were blocked from consideration. In order to give Members more time to offer their amendments, the Democratic ranking member of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY) made a unanimous consent request for 2 additional hours, which the Republican chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), denied.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why we need a rule for this simple 2-page non-controversial bill while bigger and more controversial rules, like Education and Kosovo, are brought up under restrictive rules.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MYRICK). Pursuant to House Resolution 104 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 819.

□ 1352

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 819) to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, with Mr. STEARNS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. TAYLOR) will each control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER).

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am quite pleased to bring this bill to the floor today to authorize expenditures of the Federal Maritime Commission. The Federal Maritime Commission has important work ahead to implement the important provisions of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998. That act contains the first major amendments to deregulate international ocean shipping since 1984.

H.R. 819 also contains funds for the Federal Maritime Commission to enforce the provisions of the Foreign Shipping Practices Act and to carry out the other responsibilities of the Commission. So I would urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, I would report to the House that thus far, in the early days of this Congress, the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has already had nine bills pass the House and ten other measures pass the committee and which we are prepared to bring to the floor of the House. So we are off to a very fast start on the committee and look forward to a very productive legislative session.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 819, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 1999. The Federal Maritime Commission performs a vital role of protecting our international trade from unfair practices by foreign governments and is actively engaged in implementing the new Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998. Deregulation of international maritime shipping begins May 1. The ocean carriers and shippers are quickly moving to enter into service contracts in which their competitors will no longer know the rates. A new era in competition in international shipping is about to begin.

The Commission has also been actively involved in resolving practices by the governments of China, Japan and Brazil that distort the free market system of international shipping by

imposing restrictions on U.S. carriers in these trades.

H.R. 819 authorizes \$15.6 million for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal year 2000 and \$16.3 million for fiscal year 2001. The fiscal year 2000 funding level is \$385,000 above the amount requested by the President to fund the appointment of the fifth commissioner and his staff. Mr. Chairman, this is a very reasonable budget request.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 819, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 1999.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 819, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act. The Federal Maritime Commission (FMC) was created to advocate for an open and fair system of international ocean borne transportation for U.S. imports and exports.

One of the most important responsibilities vested in the Commission is its duty to protect U.S. ocean borne trade and U.S. carriers from discriminatory or unfavorable treatment by foreign governments. The Commission has a long history of using its authority to impose sanctions and other retaliatory measures, to force foreign governments to abandon protectionist policies and to open maritime markets to U.S. companies. These ongoing actions have created business opportunities for U.S. shipping companies and provide more favorable transportation conditions for U.S. exports. Presently, the FMC is contending with the monitoring and/or reviewing conditions and activities in the U.S./China trade, commitments to reform Japanese port practices, and conditions in Brazil which may be hindering free and open ocean trade.

The FMC performs a wide range of other important statutory functions as well. This includes policing anti-competitive abuses of anti-trust immunity, various types of fraud against consumers, mis-description or mis-declarations of cargo, illegal or unfiled agreements, unlicensed freight forwarding, untariffed cargo carriage and illegal kickbacks, and unbonded passenger vessel operations. Another essential responsibility of the Commission is the oversight of carrier activity and commercial conditions in the U.S. liner trades. The Commission also conducts a variety of economic analyses of the pricing and service behavior of carriers operating in the U.S. trades, as well as research on emerging trends in the liner shipping industry. Most uniquely, the Commission provides an expeditious and inexpensive forum for the resolution of disputes between private parties involved in ocean transportation.

The territory of Guam has utilized the adjudication arm of the FMC in its quest to obtain honest and fair prices for shipping products to and from the island. These so called "rate cases" have been instrumental in exposing the historical inequity in shipping costs for Guam that have long been the unseemly by-product of the Jones Act.

Guam's potential for serving as a "clearing-house for maritime transported trade goods" is limited by the application of the Jones Act and other federal coastwise shipping laws, cargo-preference laws, and cabotage laws. Generally, these laws require that goods shipped between U.S. ports (e.g. Guam to San Francisco) must be carried on U.S. built ships that

are of U.S. registry and manned by U.S. crews.

The political coalition that protects the U.S. shipping interests through the Jones Act and associated laws is not only formidable, it is probably the best-organized and broadest coalition of interests in Washington. This coalition includes the U.S. shipbuilders who have an interest in requiring that the domestic U.S. trade be reserved for them; maritime labor unions who fight for jobs on these ships; conservative defense "hawks" who argue that only a domestic U.S. flagged fleet can be counted on in war time; and communities with strong maritime interests.

Guam makes the best case for Jones Act reform—we are technically in the domestic market of offshore trade, so a reform aimed at our specific needs would not necessarily upset the total balance of domestic political interests. Under current artificial conditions, Guam does not have adequate economies of scale to attract and sustain large port transshipment industries. For example, the rates for a container shipment from the U.S. west coast to Guam is three times higher, on average, than for a similar container going from the west coast to Japan. It is almost impossible to compete with these numbers. An unfortunate result was the 1996 relocation of the Navy's Diego Garcia supply ship from Guam to Yokosuka based on the economics of these shipping rates.

Our problem has always been the political reluctance of the "Jones Act coalition" to allow any erosion of current law. They argue that allowing one exemption, however minor, starts us down a slippery slope that jeopardizes all the other interests. The defense of the Jones Act reaches across party lines, so that neither the Democrats nor the Republicans in Congress or in the respective Democrat (Clinton) and Republican (Bush) administrations have had any burning desire to mess with it. Our most visible allies for Jones Act reform are the farmers in the Midwest who feel that the Jones Act makes their grain exports less competitive because of the artificially high transportation costs. Unfortunately, the farmers' arguments do contribute to the feeling that the slippery slope fear has some merit to it.

Transportation and trade have links, but in our case, the links are tenuous. While the world is moving to a global economy with freer trade, that trade is not going to pass through our port unless we have an economically attractive package to offer to exporters in transportation services. "Transshipment" through Guam is also hindered by customs and tariff issues. Guam is not in the U.S. customs zone, which means that except for goods manufactured on Guam, other goods arriving from Guam are foreign. Certain goods manufactured on Guam are subject to customs quotas. Multilateral trade agreements (NAFTA, APEC) are moving us in a direction where trade barriers are being eased. While we do not have complete free trade in any area, it is likely that high technology products will lead the way on this movement. But where there is free trade, the advantages of a U.S. territory outside the customs zone also may evaporate—and if the only advantage therefore is our transportation costs, then we are not attractive to exporters under the current Jones Act constraints.

Certainly, it is difficult to argue against the National Security element of the Jones Act. Admittedly, there seems to be some truth to it

and in that narrow regard, I support the arguments. However, in the case of my home territory, Guam, we will seek a workable and proven solution that will provide relief to the solitary economic anomaly of being the only U.S. port in Asia. On behalf of the people of Guam, I look forward to working with the Honorable Harold J. Creel, Jr., Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission and the Honorable Clyde Hart, Administrator of the U.S. Maritime Administration toward this end. Si Yu'os Ma'ase.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The text of H.R. 819 is as follows:

H.R. 819

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act of 1999".

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Federal Maritime Commission—

- (1) for fiscal year 2000, \$15,685,000; and
- (2) for fiscal year 2001, \$16,312,000.

The CHAIRMAN. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the designated place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a demand for a recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any proposed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

Are there any amendments to the bill?

If not, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) having assumed the chair, Mr. STEARNS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 819) to authorize appropriations for the Federal Maritime Commission for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, pursuant to House Resolution 104, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 403, nays 3, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 50]

YEAS—403

Abercrombie	Davis (FL)	Holt
Ackerman	Davis (IL)	Hooley
Aderholt	Davis (VA)	Horn
Allen	Deal	Houghton
Andrews	DeGette	Hoyer
Archer	Delahunt	Hulshof
Armey	DeLauro	Hunter
Bachus	DeLay	Hutchinson
Baird	DeMint	Hyde
Baker	Deutsch	Inslee
Baldacci	Diaz-Balart	Isakson
Baldwin	Dickey	Istook
Ballenger	Dicks	Jackson (IL)
Barcia	Dingell	Jackson-Lee
Barr	Dixon	(TX)
Barrett (NE)	Doggett	Jefferson
Barrett (WI)	Doolittle	Jenkins
Barton	Doyle	John
Bass	Dreier	Johnson (CT)
Bateman	Dunn	Johnson, E. B.
Becerra	Edwards	Johnson, Sam
Bentsen	Ehlers	Jones (NC)
Bereuter	Ehrlich	Jones (OH)
Berkley	Emerson	Kanjorski
Berman	Engel	Kaptur
Berry	English	Kasich
Biggert	Eshoo	Kelly
Bilbray	Etheridge	Kennedy
Bishop	Evans	Kildee
Blagojevich	Everett	Kilpatrick
Bliley	Ewing	Kind (WI)
Blumenauer	Farr	Kingston
Blunt	Fattah	Klecza
Boehlert	Filner	Klink
Boehner	Fletcher	Knollenberg
Bonilla	Foley	Kolbe
Bonior	Forbes	Kucinich
Bono	Ford	Kuykendall
Borski	Fossella	LaFalce
Boswell	Fowler	LaHood
Boucher	Frank (MA)	Lampson
Brady (PA)	Franks (NJ)	Lantos
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	Largent
Brown (CA)	Frost	Larson
Brown (FL)	Gallegly	Latham
Brown (OH)	Ganske	LaTourette
Bryant	Gejdenson	Lazio
Burr	Gekas	Leach
Burton	Gephardt	Lee
Buyer	Gibbons	Levin
Calvert	Gillmor	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Gilman	Lewis (GA)
Campbell	Gonzalez	Linder
Canady	Goode	Lipinski
Cannon	Goodlatte	LoBiondo
Capps	Goodling	Lofgren
Capuano	Gordon	Lowe
Cardin	Goss	Lucas (KY)
Carson	Graham	Lucas (OK)
Castle	Granger	Luther
Chabot	Green (TX)	Maloney (CT)
Chambliss	Green (WI)	Maloney (NY)
Clay	Greenwood	Manzullo
Clayton	Gutierrez	Markey
Clement	Gutnecht	Martinez
Clyburn	Hall (TX)	Mascara
Coble	Hansen	Matsui
Coburn	Hastings (WA)	McCarthy (MO)
Collins	Hayes	McCarthy (NY)
Combest	Hayworth	McCollum
Condit	Hefley	McCrery
Conyers	Herger	McDermott
Cook	Hill (IN)	McGovern
Cooksey	Hill (MT)	McHugh
Costello	Hilleary	McInnis
Cox	Hilliard	McIntosh
Coyne	Hinchey	McIntyre
Crane	Hinojosa	McKeon
Crowley	Hobson	McKinney
Cummings	Hoeffel	McNulty
Cunningham	Hoekstra	Meehan
Danner	Holden	Meek (FL)

Meeks (NY)	Regula	Stearns
Menendez	Reyes	Stenholm
Metcalf	Reynolds	Strickland
Mica	Riley	Stump
Miller (FL)	Rivers	Stupak
Miller, Gary	Rodriguez	Sununu
Miller, George	Roemer	Sweeney
Minge	Rogan	Talent
Mink	Rogers	Tancredo
Mollohan	Rohrabacher	Tanner
Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Tauscher
Moran (KS)	Rothman	Tauzin
Moran (VA)	Roukema	Taylor (MS)
Morella	Roybal-Allard	Taylor (NC)
Murtha	Royce	Terry
Myrick	Rush	Thomas
Nadler	Ryan (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Napolitano	Ryun (KS)	Thompson (MS)
Neal	Sabo	Thornberry
Nethercutt	Salmon	Thune
Ney	Sanchez	Thurman
Northup	Sanders	Tiahrt
Norwood	Sandlin	Tierney
Nussle	Sanford	Toomey
Oberstar	Sawyer	Towns
Obey	Saxton	Trafficant
Olver	Schakowsky	Udall (CO)
Ortiz	Scott	Udall (NM)
Ose	Serrano	Upton
Owens	Sessions	Velazquez
Packard	Shadegg	Visclosky
Pallone	Shaw	Walden
Pascarell	Shays	Walsh
Pastor	Sherman	Wamp
Payne	Sherwood	Waters
Pease	Shimkus	Watt (NC)
Pelosi	Shows	Watts (OK)
Peterson (MN)	Shuster	Waxman
Peterson (PA)	Simpson	Weiner
Petri	Sisisky	Weldon (FL)
Phelps	Skeen	Weller
Pickering	Skelton	Wexler
Pickett	Slaughter	Weygand
Pombo	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Pomeroy	Smith (NJ)	Wilson
Porter	Smith (TX)	Wise
Portman	Smith (WA)	Wolf
Price (NC)	Snyder	Woolsey
Quinn	Souder	Wu
Radanovich	Spence	Wynn
Rahall	Spratt	Young (AK)
Ramstad	Stabenow	Young (FL)
Rangel	Stark	

NAYS—3

Chenoweth	Paul	Sensenbrenner
-----------	------	---------------

NOT VOTING—27

Bartlett	Hall (OH)	Pryce (OH)
Bilirakis	Hastings (FL)	Scarborough
Boyd	Hostettler	Schaffer
Callahan	King (NY)	Turner
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Vento
Cubin	Millender	Watkins
DeFazio	McDonald	Weldon (PA)
Dooley	Moakley	Wicker
Duncan	Oxley	
Gilchrest	Pitts	

□ 1419

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 50, on H.R. 819, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 774, by the yeas and nays;

H. Con. Res. 24, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

WOMEN'S BUSINESS CENTER
AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 774, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 774, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 385, nays 23, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 51]

YEAS—385

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Gillmor
Ackerman	Collins	Gilman
Aderholt	Combest	Gonzalez
Allen	Condit	Goode
Andrews	Conyers	Goodling
Archer	Cook	Gordon
Army	Cooksey	Goss
Bachus	Costello	Graham
Baird	Coyne	Granger
Baker	Crowley	Green (TX)
Baldacci	Cummings	Green (WI)
Baldwin	Cunningham	Greenwood
Ballenger	Danner	Gutierrez
Barcia	Davis (FL)	Gutknecht
Barr	Davis (IL)	Hall (OH)
Barrett (NE)	Davis (VA)	Hall (TX)
Barrett (WI)	Deal	Hansen
Barton	DeGette	Hastings (WA)
Bass	Delahunt	Hayes
Bateman	DeLauro	Hayworth
Becerra	DeMint	Hill (IN)
Bentsen	Deutsch	Hill (MT)
Bereuter	Diaz-Balart	Hilleary
Berkley	Dickey	Hilliard
Berman	Dicks	Hinchey
Berry	Dingell	Hinojosa
Biggett	Dixon	Hobson
Bilbray	Doggett	Hoeffel
Bilirakis	Dooley	Hoekstra
Bishop	Doyle	Holden
Blagojevich	Dreier	Holt
Bliley	Dunn	Hooley
Blumenauer	Edwards	Horn
Blunt	Ehlers	Houghton
Boehlert	Ehrlich	Hoyer
Boehner	Emerson	Hulshof
Bonior	Engel	Hulshof
Bono	English	Hunter
Borski	Eshoo	Hutchinson
Boswell	Etheridge	Hyde
Boucher	Evans	Inslee
Brady (PA)	Everett	Isakson
Brady (TX)	Ewing	Istook
Brown (CA)	Farr	Jackson (IL)
Brown (FL)	Fattah	Jackson-Lee
Brown (OH)	Filner	(TX)
Bryant	Fletcher	Jefferson
Burr	Foley	Jenkins
Burton	Forbes	John
Buyer	Ford	Johnson (CT)
Calvert	Fossella	Johnson, E. B.
Camp	Fowler	Johnson, Sam
Capps	Frank (MA)	Jones (NC)
Capuano	Franks (NJ)	Jones (OH)
Cardin	Frelinghuysen	Kanjorski
Carson	Frost	Kaptur
Castle	Gallegly	Kasich
Chabot	Ganske	Kelly
Chambliss	Gejdenson	Kennedy
Clay	Gekas	Kildee
Clayton	Gephardt	Kilpatrick
Clement	Gibbons	Kind (WI)
		Kingston

Klecza	Ney	Shows
Klink	Northup	Shuster
Knollenberg	Norwood	Simpson
Kolbe	Nussle	Sisisky
Kucinich	Oberstar	Skeen
Kuykendall	Obey	Skelton
LaFalce	Olver	Smith (MI)
LaHood	Ortiz	Smith (NJ)
Lampson	Ose	Smith (TX)
Lantos	Owens	Smith (WA)
Largent	Oxley	Snyder
Larson	Packard	Souder
Latham	Pallone	Spence
LaTourette	Pascarell	Spratt
Lazio	Pastor	Stabenow
Leach	Payne	Stark
Lee	Pease	Stearns
Levin	Pelosi	Stenholm
Lewis (CA)	Peterson (MN)	Strickland
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (PA)	Stupak
Linder	Petri	Sununu
Lipinski	Phelps	Sweeney
LoBiondo	Pickering	Talent
Lofgren	Pickett	Tanner
Lowey	Pombo	Tauscher
Lucas (KY)	Pomeroy	Tauzin
Lucas (OK)	Porter	Terry
Luther	Portman	Thomas
Maloney (CT)	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Maloney (NY)	Quinn	Thompson (MS)
Markey	Radanovich	Thornberry
Martinez	Rahall	Thune
Mascara	Ramstad	Thurman
Matsui	Rangel	Tiahrt
McCarthy (MO)	Regula	Tierney
McCollum	Reyes	Toomey
McCrery	Reynolds	Towns
McDermott	Riley	Trafficant
McGovern	Rivers	Udall (CO)
McHugh	Rodriguez	Udall (NM)
McInnis	Roemer	Upton
McIntosh	Rogan	Velazquez
McIntyre	Rogers	Vento
McKeon	Ros-Lehtinen	Visclosky
Goss	Rothman	Walden
McKinney	Roukema	Walsh
McNulty	Roybal-Allard	Wamp
Meehan	Rush	Waters
Meek (FL)	Ryan (WI)	Watkins
Meeks (NY)	Ryun (KS)	Watt (NC)
Menendez	Sabo	Watts (OK)
Metcalf	Salmon	Waxman
Mica	Sanchez	Weiner
Miller, George	Sanders	Weldon (FL)
Minge	Sandlin	Weller
Mink	Sawyer	Wexler
Moakley	Saxton	Weygand
Mollohan	Schakowsky	Whitfield
Moore	Scott	Wilson
Moran (KS)	Serrano	Wise
Moran (VA)	Sessions	Wolf
Morella	Shadegg	Woolsey
Murtha	Shaw	Wu
Myrick	Shays	Wynn
Nadler	Sherman	Young (AK)
Napolitano	Sherwood	Young (FL)
Neal	Shimkus	
Nethercutt		

NAYS—23

Campbell	DeLay	Royce
Canady	Doolittle	Sanford
Cannon	Hefley	Sensenbrenner
Chenoweth	Herger	Stump
Coble	Manzullo	Tancredo
Coburn	Miller, Gary	Taylor (MS)
Cox	Paul	Taylor (NC)
Crane	Rohrabacher	

NOT VOTING—25

Bartlett	Goodlatte	Pitts
Bonilla	Hastings (FL)	Pryce (OH)
Boyd	Hostettler	Scarborough
Callahan	King (NY)	Schaffer
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Slaughter
Cubin	McCarthy (NY)	Turner
DeFazio	Millender	Weldon (PA)
Duncan	McDonald	Wicker
Gilchrest	Miller (FL)	

□ 1437

Mr. HERGER and Mr. GARY MILLER of California changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 51 on H.R. 774, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 51 on H.R. 774, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes."

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 51 on H.R. 774, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

EXPRESSING OPPOSITION TO DECLARATION OF PALESTINIAN STATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 24.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 24, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 380, nays 24, answered "present" 2, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 52]

YEAS—380

Abercrombie	Brown (FL)	DeMint
Ackerman	Brown (OH)	Deutsch
Aderholt	Bryant	Diaz-Balart
Allen	Burr	Dickey
Andrews	Burton	Dicks
Archer	Buyer	Dixon
Armey	Calvert	Doggett
Bachus	Camp	Dooley
Baird	Canady	Doolittle
Baker	Cannon	Doyle
Baldacci	Capps	Dreier
Baldwin	Capuano	Dunn
Ballenger	Cardin	Edwards
Barcia	Carson	Ehlers
Barr	Castle	Ehrlich
Barrett (NE)	Chabot	Emerson
Barrett (WI)	Chambliss	Engel
Barton	Chenoweth	English
Bateman	Clayton	Eshoo
Becerra	Clement	Etheridge
Bentsen	Clyburn	Evans
Bereuter	Coble	Everett
Berkley	Coburn	Ewing
Berman	Collins	Farr
Berry	Combest	Fattah
Biggert	Condit	Filner
Bilbray	Cook	Fletcher
Bilirakis	Costello	Foley
Bishop	Cox	Forbes
Blagojevich	Coyne	Ford
Bliley	Crane	Fossella
Blumenauer	Crowley	Fowler
Blunt	Cummings	Frank (MA)
Boehler	Cunningham	Franks (NJ)
Boehner	Danner	Frelinghuysen
Bonilla	Davis (FL)	Frost
Bono	Davis (IL)	Gallegly
Borski	Davis (VA)	Ganske
Boswell	Deal	Gejdenson
Boucher	DeGette	Gekas
Brady (PA)	Delahunt	Gephardt
Brady (TX)	DeLauro	Gibbons
Brown (CA)	DeLay	Gillmor

Gilman	Luther	Salmon
Gonzalez	Maloney (CT)	Sanchez
Goode	Maloney (NY)	Sanders
Goodlatte	Manzullo	Sandlin
Goodling	Markay	Sanford
Gordon	Martinez	Sawyer
Goss	Mascara	Saxton
Graham	Matsui	Schakowsky
Granger	McCarthy (MO)	Scott
Green (TX)	McCarthy (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Green (WI)	McCollum	Serrano
Greenwood	McCrery	Sessions
Gutierrez	McDermott	Shadegg
Gutknecht	McGovern	Shaw
Hall (OH)	McHugh	Shays
Hall (TX)	McInnis	Sherman
Hansen	McIntosh	Sherwood
Hastert	McIntyre	Shimkus
Hastings (WA)	McKeon	Shows
Hayes	McNulty	Shuster
Hayworth	Meehan	Simpson
Hefley	Meek (FL)	Sisisky
Herger	Meeks (NY)	Skeen
Hill (IN)	Menendez	Skelton
Hill (MT)	Metcalf	Slaughter
Hilleary	Mica	Smith (MI)
Hilliard	Miller (FL)	Smith (NJ)
Hinchey	Miller, Gary	Smith (TX)
Hinojosa	Minge	Smith (WA)
Hobson	Mink	Snyder
Hoeffel	Moakley	Spence
Hoekstra	Mollohan	Spratt
Holden	Moore	Stabenow
Holt	Moran (KS)	Stearns
Hooley	Morella	Stenholm
Horn	Myrick	Strickland
Hoyer	Nadler	Stump
Hulshof	Napolitano	Stupak
Hutchinson	Neal	Sweeney
Hyde	Nethercutt	Talent
Inslee	Northup	Tancredo
Isakson	Norwood	Tanner
Istook	Nussle	Tauscher
Jackson-Lee	Oberstar	Tauzin
(TX)	Olver	Taylor (MS)
Jefferson	Ortiz	Taylor (NC)
Jenkins	Ose	Terry
Johnson (CT)	Owens	Thomas
Johnson, E. B.	Oxley	Thompson (CA)
Johnson, Sam	Packard	Thompson (MS)
Jones (OH)	Pallone	Thornberry
Kaptur	Pascarell	Thune
Kasich	Pastor	Thurman
Kelly	Pease	Tiahrt
Kennedy	Pelosi	Tierney
Kildee	Peterson (PA)	Toomey
Kilpatrick	Petri	Towns
Kind (WI)	Phelps	Traficant
Kingston	Pickering	Udall (CO)
Klecza	Pickett	Udall (NM)
Klink	Pombo	Upton
Knollenberg	Pomeroy	Velazquez
Kolbe	Porter	Vento
Kuykendall	Portman	Visclosky
LaFalce	Price (NC)	Walden
LaHood	Quinn	Walsh
Lampson	Ramstad	Wamp
Lantos	Rangel	Watkins
Largent	Regula	Watts (OK)
Larson	Reyes	Waxman
Latham	Reynolds	Weiner
LaTourette	Riley	Weldon (FL)
Lazio	Rodriguez	Weller
Leach	Roemer	Wexler
Levin	Rogan	Weygand
Lewis (CA)	Rogers	Whitfield
Lewis (GA)	Ros-Lehtinen	Wilson
Linder	Roukema	Wise
Lipinski	Roybal-Allard	Wolf
LoBiondo	Royce	Woolsey
Lofgren	Rush	Wu
Lowey	Ryan (WI)	Wynn
Lucas (KY)	Ryun (KS)	Young (AK)
Lucas (OK)	Sabo	Young (FL)

NAYS—24

Bonior	Kanjorski	Paul
Campbell	Kucinich	Payne
Clay	Lee	Rahall
Conyers	McKinney	Rohrabacher
Dingell	Miller, George	Stark
Houghton	Moran (VA)	Sununu
Jackson (IL)	Murtha	Waters
John	Ney	Watt (NC)

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—2

Radanovich

Rivers

NOT VOTING—28

Bartlett	Hastings (FL)	Pitts
Bass	Hostettler	Pryce (OH)
Boyd	Hunter	Rothman
Callahan	Jones (NC)	Scarborough
Cooksey	King (NY)	Schaffer
Cramer	Lewis (KY)	Souder
Cubin	Millender-	Turner
DeFazio	McDonald	Weldon (PA)
Duncan	Obey	Wicker
Gilchrest	Peterson (MN)	

□ 1448

Mr. THOMAS changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, I missed the rollcall vote on H.R. 819, the Federal Maritime Commission Authorization Act, because my plane into Washington was delayed. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote No. 52, on H. Con. Res. 24, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 820, COAST GUARD AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-54) on the resolution (H. Res. 113) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 975, REDUCING VOLUME OF STEEL IMPORTS AND ESTABLISHING STEEL IMPORT NOTIFICATION AND MONITORING PROGRAM

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106-55) on the resolution (H. Res. 114) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each:

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

STEEL CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I want to speak briefly on the steel issue tonight because tomorrow during the debate we have several markups where I may be tied up and may not be able to give a statement on the floor, plus I couldn't give them as extended remarks.

There will be much talk tomorrow about the question of free trade versus fair trade, and I wanted to register my opinions as somebody who is concerned about how to promote international trade and at the same time make sure that that trade is fair.

As we are aware, since July of 1997, as a result of the collapse of numerous economies around the world, there has been a flood of imports into the United States. Foreign corporations from Japan, Korea, Russia and a host of other countries have been selling steel at as much as \$100 a ton less than it costs them to produce it. Steel producers from Russia, one of the more egregious examples, were allowed to dump 47 percent more steel on our market than was shipped in 1997. We simply cannot allow this to continue.

We cannot have free trade if some people cheat. Russia is a particularly interesting case. Last fall, I was part of a Duma-House of Representatives' exchange where I spent a number of days in Russia. The steel industry was tremendously important and still is to the Soviet regime. It represents both an obvious source of the war machine there and reflected an almost excessive emphasis on manufacturing.

Enormous resources were mobilized and poured into this industry, without regard for market forces or efficient use of capital. This awesome industrial effort transformed vast rural regions into major steel producers. By the 1970s, the Soviets created by far the largest steel industry the world had seen. For many years, the Soviet Union was the leading producer, about 186 million tons in 1986, but there still was and still is no reliable cost data, no standardized accounting practices and no interest in even thinking of market efficiencies. In fact, most of their business transactions were conducted in barter, even paying taxes with steel.

The breakup of the Soviet Union has created a significant crisis for their steel industry. To say domestic demand has dropped is a laughable understatement. Russian steel's traditional market, especially the Soviet war machine, pales in comparison to what it

once was. Russian GNP has fallen over 42 percent since 1989. Steel consumption, once 970 pounds, per capita has fallen to 265 today.

In 1997, it was estimated that they had nearly 5 times as much steel-making capacity as was needed to meet domestic demand, yet production continued. By mid-1998, Russian mills exported about 65 percent of their output, some even 100 percent of their output, usually at prices well below market levels.

In May 1998, Metal Bulletin reported that, incredibly, Russian plate and hot-rolled coils were being sold in some markets at less than half the prevailing domestic market price.

By late 1998, at least 30 countries had imposed import restrictions against Soviet companies or were preparing to do so. In 1998, the U.S. bore the brunt of this tremendous Russian onslaught. The President proposed a suspension agreement that represented a 78 percent reduction from the 1998 level, a good start but nowhere near enough.

Essentially, this still allows a significant amount of dumping to occur. We must do more.

In the meetings with the Duma, I raised this issue of dumping and their response is particularly telling. For those who tell me that this is a free trade issue, it simply is not. When I raised the fundamental injustice of their subsidization of energy costs, in my district we have the lowest producing steel companies in the world, Steel Dynamics being the example, and they have seen their energy costs soar, and when I raised this problem they advised me that we should do like they do; they said, we own our energy producers. Therefore, our energy costs are nothing.

That is a creative cost accounting way to get around the principle of free trade. This simply is not free trade. We in America cannot tell our foundries, we cannot tell our steel companies, that they have all these regulations, they have all of these energy prices, now go out there and compete freely, when we allow, contrary to free market principles, people to dump at below cost.

The principle of free trade requires fair trade and equitable trade. The President cannot merely say we are going to kind of jawbone with these other countries that have had the problems in Asia, that have had the problems in South America, the problems in Russia and then make us promises to enforce the rule of law. We need to do it.

I heard really moving stories about how in Russia and other countries steel workers have been laid off, how towns are being shuttered. Well, come to America. Whether it is in Pennsylvania or Indiana or all over this country, we have steel workers out of work, too. Only we have steel workers out of work because people did not follow the laws that are essential to making free trade work.

This bill that we are going to consider tomorrow not only rolls the level of imports back to where it was before the illegal dumping came but also establishes a more effective steel import monitoring system. It is essential, if we are to have free trade, to make sure that it is fair.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SESSIONS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. CARSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. FOLEY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

GHB—DATE RAPE DRUG

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am back again. I am back again because young people are still dying from the date rape drug called GHB. I do, however, want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK), the ranking member, for having me before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on the dangerous effects of GHB.

It is an important topic to me because young people are still losing their lives, and parents are not informed of the dangerousness of GHB. This uncontrolled substance has been used to commit date rape by rendering victims helpless to defend themselves against attack. But Mr. Speaker, teenagers, teenagers who have no history of drug use are dying.

So I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the chairman of the Committee on Commerce Chairman and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the ranking member, and encourage a quick hearing on this matter, along with the Subcommittee on Health and the Environment of the Committee on Commerce, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. BILIRAKIS), and certainly I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), chairman of the Subcommittee on Crime, of which I sit on the Committee on the Judiciary, and let me thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), because we are committed to working together.

The GHB legislation that I am sponsoring, H.R. 75, is named in honor of a 17-year-old from my community, Hillary J. Farias from LaPorte, Texas.

Hillary died from an overdose of GHB that was put in her soda in a teenage nondrinking club on August 5, 1996. The gentlemen from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and (Mr. STUPAK) have seen the same kinds of deaths in Michigan.

My bill, H.R. 75, directs the Attorney General to schedule GHB as a Schedule I drug and to establish programs throughout the country to educate young people about the use of controlled substances. The DEA has been working to place this drug on Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act at the Federal level, and we are looking forward to the testing and report by the Food and Drug Administration.

Do we realize that the GHB formula is on the Internet and it is made by the tub loads for these parties around the Nation. We realize that young people who have never been drug users are silently using this by way of those who think it is a joke or would like to see them immobilized and are dropping this in their nonalcoholic drinks. It has no taste or smell.

Scheduling the drug on the Federal Controlled Substances Act allows Federal prosecutors to punish anyone who uses the drug under the Drug Induced Rape Prevention and Punishment Act. Certainly, it would prohibit these untimely and tragic deaths. Specifically, my bill would increase the sentence for someone using GHB to commit a sex crime to 20 years imprisonment.

GHB has been used to render victims helpless to defend against attack and it even erases any memory of the attack. It is responsible for as many as 60 emergency room admissions in the past 6 months in Houston.

The recipe for this drug and its analogs can be accessed, as I said, on the Internet. In checking some of the web sites that focus on GHB, I was shocked to discover how easy it was to find misleading information on the effects on this drug. It is being touted as an anti-depressant, an aphrodisiac, a euphoriant, and as a sleep aid. One site even contends that the deaths attributable to GHB are actually caused by other underlying health problems.

How about that? A 17-year-old volleyball player died with an overdose of GHB where a grandmother could not wake her the next morning, and she never made it to the hospital.

I do believe if there are medicinal purposes for GHB, we can work through it. But the testimony last week before the subcommittee showed there is great evidence from law enforcement, DEA and other victims to suggest we must do something about GHB. I am looking forward to working with my colleagues, Mr. STUPAK and Mr. UPTON and Mr. KLINK, Mr. BLILEY and Mr. DINGELL and Mr. BILIRAKIS to ensure that we stop this siege now.

Oh, yes, many people will say too many laws, but there are never enough laws to save our teenagers. What do we say to a family who says, she was a good kid, she never took drugs, she was athletic. I know she would not do this

to herself, and yet she is now dead, along with other teenagers younger than her.

So as a mother and a legislator, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and our efforts to protect women from violent sexual assault and as well, those innocent victims who now have lost their lives. We can do no less in tribute to them. Let us move this legislation, this collaborative legislation that we can work together on swiftly, quickly, fast, expeditiously, so that we can go on record in this Congress for saving young lives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

MAKING THE R&D TAX CREDIT PERMANENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the R&D tax credit, a program that has done a lot to help our technology sector in the United States, and as these charts show, the technology sector has done a lot to contribute to the job growth in this country. It is the key, the cornerstone to the growth that we are going to experience in the years ahead and most of the growth that we have experienced in this decade to this point. We must do everything we can to encourage the technology sector.

The R&D tax credit is set to expire, as it does every year. I urge that we do not reauthorize it, but we make it permanent.

The first big point is that the technology sector drives job growth, and the chart that I have brought with me shows how the computer industry and the technology sector in general, first of all, it pays more. The jobs that we have in this sector on average pay twice as much as typical jobs in other areas of the economy. It also shows that the job growth, the jobs that are being created, are coming predominantly from the high-tech sector. Also, in the 10 years ahead, that is going to become even more the case. Technology is what is driving our economy, and the R&D tax credit helps that technology grow.

The second chart that I want to show shows specifically how the R&D tax credit helps. It helps because it helps increase the productivity of companies across all sectors. Because computers are a part of a company whether one is in the technology business or not, whether one makes computers or software for the Internet or if one makes airplanes or furniture or just about anything, having money for R&D helps

you increase your productivity and more and better jobs. This has just some of the various sectors of our economy that have benefited substantially from the R&D tax credit that has created jobs.

That is what this is all about. We may look at these industries and sectors and think well, gosh, I do not work in the pharmaceutical industry or the computer industry, but no matter where one works in the American economy, technology touches us, and the R&D tax credit helps advance that.

I would like us to make it permanent this time instead of doing the year-after-year reauthorization. First of all, as I have argued, this is a very good program and should be made permanent, but more importantly long term planning of companies that depend on this tax credit could be greatly enhanced if they knew it was going to be there from year-to-year. They could invest even more in the R&D tax credit over the long haul, knowing that it is going to be around, knowing that every year they are not going to have to come back and try to seek reauthorization. This is a program that should be permanent because it does so much for our economy.

Technology touches on a lot of issues, the R&D tax credit being just one of them. I strongly urge that our government get in touch with high-tech issues in the high-tech industry and find out what we can do to help them. It is critical to our job growth. Technology crosses all sectors. Yes, there are the ones that we think of off the top of our heads when we think of technology. We think of telecommunications, we think of hardware and software, we think of the Internet. But just about any industry we have benefits from a better computer system, from better software, from access to the Internet. They can make better products, they can transfer that information all across the world to various segments of their business to help that business grow. This touches everything. We will not find an industry that is not high-tech.

I ran into someone from the company Kosco out in my area which sells food and various other products on a sort of wholesale retail basis, and they thought of themselves as not being a high-tech company. But they too are dependent on the computer systems that help them keep track of their inventory, that help them track their financial records, their sales records, and the faster and better those systems become, the more efficient and the more productive their business becomes. It does not matter what sector of the economy one is in. Technology affects us, and the R&D tax credit can help us have better jobs that pay more and will also help create more and more jobs for those who do not have them yet.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge this body to adopt a permanent authorization of the R&D tax credit as soon as

possible for the sake of our future economic growth.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DOOLEY of California addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Ms. HOOLEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. WISE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

H.R. 961, THE OVARIAN CANCER RESEARCH AND INFORMATION AMENDMENTS OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that I have recently introduced H.R. 961, the Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1999, and would like to invite my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

H.R. 961 builds upon the Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1997, H.R. 953 which had 85 cosponsors in the 105th Congress.

The Ovarian Cancer Research and Information Amendments of 1999 has three components. First, it authorizes \$150 million of ovarian cancer research. One half to be spent on basic cancer research and one half on clinical trials and treatment.

Of this research, the bill requires that priority be given to: developing a test for the early detection of ovarian cancer; research to identify precursor lesions and research to determine the manner in which benign conditions progress to malignant status; research to determine the relationship between ovarian cancer and endometriosis; and requires that appropriate counseling, including on the issue of genetic basis, be provided to women who participate as subjects in research.

Second, the bill provides for a comprehensive information program to provide the patients and the public information regarding screening procedures; information on the genetic basis to ovarian cancer; any known factors which increase risk of getting ovarian cancer; and any new treatments for ovarian cancer.

Finally, it requires that the National Cancer Advisory Board include one or more individuals who are at high risk for developing ovarian cancer.

Unlike the bill from the previous Congress, H.R. 961 does not contain the section authorizing a Specialized Program of Research Ex-

cellence (SPORE) for Ovarian Cancer. Although this was a major component of the previous bill, I am pleased to report that the Scientific Advisory Board at the National Cancer Institute approved a SPORE for Ovarian Cancer last year and funding for it should be released this summer.

I would like to commend the National Cancer Research Institute for their efforts on this particular subject.

I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this bill and help to give women a fighting chance against ovarian cancer.

H.R. 473—PROVIDING ASSISTANCE TO FARMERS FOR CROP DISEASES AND VIRUSES

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced H.R. 473, to ensure that farmers who suffer crop losses due to plant viruses and plant diseases are eligible for crop insurance and noninsured crop assistance programs and that agricultural producers who suffer such losses are eligible for emergency loans.

Pandemics of plant viruses and diseases regularly destroy the crops of entire farms and often the crops of entire geographic areas. A single plant virus or disease outbreak can send farms into bankruptcy and farmers are left without any means of recovering. Agriculture producers can qualify for emergency loans when adverse weather conditions and other natural phenomena have caused severe physical crop property damage or production losses, however, under current law, crop viruses and diseases are not considered "natural disasters" and thus are not eligible for these types of loans.

For example, in Hawaii, the State recently ordered the eradication of all banana plants on the entire island of Kauai and in a 10 square-mile area on the Big Island in an effort to eradicate the banana "bunchy top" virus. A court order required compliance of all who did not cooperate and farmers were ordered to destroy their entire farm and livelihood without any compensation. These farmers do not qualify for emergency loans or disaster assistance and many were left with no other option but to sell their farms.

The survival of our Nation's farmers is largely dependent upon the unpredictable temper of mother nature. We provide our farmers with assistance when adversely affected by severe weather but that is not enough. Emergency loans and disaster assistance must be made available to farmers for crops suffering from calamitous plant viruses and diseases.

H.R. 473 would enable farmers to qualify for crop insurance programs, noninsured assistance programs, and low-interest emergency loans, when devastated by crop losses due to plant viruses and diseases.

I invite my colleagues to cosponsor this worthy legislation and I urge immediate consideration of H.R. 473 in the House.

CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about an issue that is absolutely crucial to our

democracy, and that issue is the issue of reforming our campaign finance system.

America is built, I say to my colleagues, on a system of a marketplace of ideas where we enter into elections, we debate ideas, we are out front, trying to figure out where we should move as a country, what direction we should go in as a country. That marketplace of ideas is being interfered with today, because what is happening is the biggest checkbook is determining what goes on in America, rather than the people's voices.

As one person said, "The poor man's soap box does not equal the rich man's checkbook." So we need to return to those basic democratic principles, and if we reform our campaign finance system, we can do that.

This is an issue that calls for bipartisanship. We have got to see the kind of bipartisanship that we have seen on this issue in the past. The Shays-Meehan bill, which is the bill I have signed on to and many Members of my freshman class and many Members from both sides of the aisle have signed on to, last year passed the House of Representatives 252 to 179 in August of 1998. This year, we have seen even more support than last year. We have more cosponsors at this point. Mr. Speaker, we have 110 cosponsors at this point, with 27 Republicans.

When we take the new Members, we have more support than we did last year, and it is bipartisan support, it is encouraging to see friends from both sides of the aisle rising and joining on an issue that is so important to our democracy.

People say that there is no support. I have heard the comment over and over again. People say there is no support for campaign finance reform. We cannot limit in any way the system. People do not want it. Well, I say to my colleagues, the voters are disenchanted and part of the reason they are disenchanted is because they view the system as one that is being controlled by money. They view the system as one that is controlled by special interests, and they do not believe that their voices are being heard. The undue influence of money is an absolutely crucial issue.

This bill, the Shays-Meehan bill, would ban soft money. It would take soft money completely out of the system. Some people have described soft money as the cancer on our democracy, I think a very apt description.

Let us talk a little bit about the disenchantment of citizens. Mr. Speaker, 30 years ago in this Nation, 75 percent of the people, 75 percent of the people when they were asked the question said, they trusted government to do the right thing, trusted elected officials to do the right thing most of the time, and 25 percent said they did not. Now, a generation later, we have 75 percent of the people saying they do not trust elected officials to do the

right thing most of the time. Not a very tough test, but that is what they say. So in a generation, we have eroded the trust, the credibility in our electoral system.

Well, this campaign finance system that we have now is what is undermining that credibility. It is what is getting to the people, saying that it is actually convincing people that they should not participate in our democracy, that they should not be a part of our democracy.

Let me say to my colleagues, this bill, this bill is not all that should be done. I support this bill. We are going to push this bill through the House. But more can be done, and that is what is so hopeful about this bill. Because one of the things we are going to see is a commission. Mr. Speaker, a 12-member commission, after this law is passed, is going to meet 180 days after the adjournment of the session and is going to report on other major reforms that should be taken in this area.

□ 1515

They are going to study issues and bring back to us major reforms, and those reforms will have to be voted up or down along the same lines as the Base Closing Commission operates.

The other fact that I think needs to be noted is that the Federal Government is far, far behind the States on this issue. The States are making huge changes in their campaign finance system. The State of Maine had a ballot initiative in 1996, over 2 years ago, where 56 percent of the voters said we do not like the current system. Let us change it. They passed a \$3 checkoff, and 80,000 have already signed up for that checkoff. They have a financing system that cuts government in order to get the revenues to finance their campaign finance system. They have taken a big step to clean up the system.

In Arizona, taxpayers have done the same thing. They have increased lobbyist fees from \$25 to \$100 to try to do everything they can to raise the money to operate a decent system. They have created voluntary tax checkoff on their tax forms, and they have imposed a 20 percent surcharge on civil and criminal fines in order to raise money to operate the system better.

Massachusetts has also taken major reforms at the State level.

So I say to Members now is the time to return democracy to the people. In order to do that, a big step would be made by endorsing campaign finance reform legislation in the form of the Shays-Meehan bill. We have to do it early. We have to do it now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Kansas (Mr. MOORE) for his statements on this issue.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to rise in support of the Shays-Meehan bill which is now pending before this Congress. As the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL) has al-

ready pointed out, it passed the 105th Congress and died a slow death in the Senate. We need to revive and pass this legislation and do it early.

I think most people would agree that politics and public service have become something of a negative and distasteful word to a lot of people in this country, and it really should not be that way. Politics is a noble profession, as is public service. Politics, after all, is really the art of governing without guns.

I think the public reaction, the adverse reaction that we have and that we see in this country to political campaigns is a direct result of the public perception that both political parties are awash in corrupt money. People in this country believe that both parties receive so much corrupt money from interest groups, from lobbyists, from other sources, that the whole system is corrupt. We need to change that perception. We dramatically need to change that perception.

Right now, the Shays-Meehan bill, if we pass this bill, will ban soft money. It will also regulate so-called issue ads which were intended to influence the outcome of elections for or against a particular candidate.

Mr. Speaker, even an 8-year-old child watching one of these issue ads could tell which side the interest group is supporting by the expenditure of money. We need to restore public confidence in our electoral process, and I believe the only way we can do that is to pass a strong finance campaign law such as Shays-Meehan.

I urge all of the Members of this body in the House of Representatives to vote in favor of the Shays-Meehan bill. It passed the last Congress. It should pass this Congress. We need to send a message to the United States that it also should pass that body and be enacted into law.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kansas for his excellent comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), my cousin.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Mexico for yielding to me to speak on this very important issue facing us today in the 106th Congress.

I am pleased to join my freshman colleagues in calling for this early consideration of campaign finance reform in our 106th Congress. I know that a lot of my colleagues, many of my colleagues share my concern that the high cost of elections and the flood of so-called soft money, special interest money may threaten the integrity of our electoral system.

Just 6 months ago, the majority of our House voted to pass the Shays-Meehan bill. This bill had at that time, and I believe still has, strong bipartisan support. This is for a number of reasons. Let me tell my colleagues about a few of them, Mr. Speaker.

First is that unlimited soft money contributions allow special interests to buy political access. It is important to

point out that soft money, unlike hard money, is unregulated. On the hard money side, there are limits on the amounts of money one can contribute. It is also transparent. It is public money. Soft money is much harder to trace. We need to make sure that the policy decisions that we make here are not unduly influenced by these special interests.

Secondly, the high cost of elections now contributes to the public's perception that elections and, therefore, public servants can be bought and sold. I think, especially given the events of these last months, more public cynicism is not now what we need about our U.S. Congress.

Third, more and more time spent chasing money means that less time is devoted to our public duties as Representatives. We need to restore this balance. All of us, Republicans and Democrats, who ran for the Congress this last election for the first time, and we are elected as freshmen, know how much time we spent on the telephone and at fund-raising events rather than studying issues of importance around public policies, whether it is education or Social Security or health care. We need to restore that balance so that we can spend more of our time on those important issues and less time on raising money.

Fourth, the high cost of campaigns unfairly restricts the process in many cases to those who can afford to run. We need a system that is equitable for all candidates. This country has been built on the idea that all of us are equal, that it is an egalitarian system. We ought to make sure that anybody what wants to and has a passion can run for office, not just those people who have deep pockets.

Fifth, and I think maybe most importantly, a majority of Americans, in fact an enormous majority, a New York Times survey shows that 9 out of 10 Americans think that we ought to have significant campaign finance reform. We are here to listen to our constituents and represent our constituents. We ought to be doing that on campaign finance reform.

It is early in our session, but we need to act now so that we can begin to put this legislation in place for the races in the year 2000. I am here to speak in favor of beginning that process.

I am proud to be a sponsor of the bipartisan Shays-Meehan campaign finance reform bill. I have to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I recognize the bill may need some work. It is probably not perfect. But we ought to bring it up so that it sees the light of day. We ought to begin a debate in committee. We ought to bring it to the floor of the House.

So let us start today. Let us address this problem now. Let us make sure that we bring this legislation forward and we begin to restore common sense to our campaign finance reform system.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for those comments.

The gentleman from Colorado mentioned the issue of spending time and how it takes away from the job. It seems to me, as I have been here for this short period of time, and I am sure that it impresses upon him that the number of issues that the United States Congress deals with and that the House deals with, whether it is international issues in Kosovo, whether it is education and health care, Social Security, Medicare, I mean, every day, there is so much for us to learn.

We could be much better at legislating if we had the time to spend on those issues, studying the issues, meeting with people that have concerns, trying to do everything we can to educate ourselves.

I think all of us know that, when we are out there fund-raising, we are taking time away from something that we should be spending time on. Yet we know that we have to be prepared to deal with these sham issue ads and attack ads that come from other sides. So we are caught in a rough place. I know the gentleman from Colorado has been through a campaign where he has had something like that happen. The gentleman from Colorado may want to talk a little bit about that.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I agree. Let me give my colleagues a couple of examples. I probably spent many days on the campaign trail, 4 or 5, 6 hours on the telephone making these phone calls. I even got to the point where I purchased a headset so that I could save my neck from the constant strain of holding that telephone handset.

I know there are people out there who do that for a living, and a headset is a great tool. But it was symbolic to me that I was not out visiting with people and learning about the issues and studying the broad range of things that we are faced with while we are here in the Congress.

Let me talk a little bit about the issue ads and so-called expenditure campaigns. These groups can come in and be for you or be against you. But in either case one has no say, no control over these ads that are running.

In particular, I have been concerned about groups who think they might want to support me, but they could be running negative campaigns against my opponents when that is not the way I want to campaign. So we need to get ahold of these independent expenditure campaigns. We need to get ahold of this soft money situation.

As Jefferson talked about, when democracy is ailing, one of the best solutions, one of the best treatments is more sunshine, more transparency. We need to make sure that all of the money that is contributed to our campaigns is visible, and people can track it and trace it. We could use the Internet. We could have almost instantaneous disclosure. I would certainly sup-

port that. I think many Members of the House of Representatives would.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the issue ads, it seems to me, are something that, I do not know in the State of Colorado, but I know in New Mexico that the issue ads are a completely different thing when one gets to the Federal level. I mean I ran 2 years, two times, two terms as State Attorney General. I never saw an issue add. I never had an independent group come in and attack me or speak up for my opponent. They did not clutter the debate that was going on, the very serious debate about the issues.

But one gets in the Federal race, and it is remarkable the change that takes place. Big national groups raising soft money, raising hard money, come into one's district, they label themselves with the most innocuous sounding labels, Responsible Citizens For Good Government, and then they get in there and slash and burn against one's opponent or for you or however it comes out.

It generally is very, very negative stuff. They are dumping things that candidates would not ever touch. They are getting into issues that candidates would be editorialized against, would be criticized bringing up the issues. They have changed the whole tenor of the campaign.

I really believe that those issue ads with these changes we make will go a long way, will go a long way towards reforming the system, because if one has to disclose who is supporting them, if one has to have it in hard dollars, it is going to make a big difference.

I do not know what the gentleman's thoughts are on that, but I am sure that he has seen the same thing in his elections in Colorado, that maybe he does not see these issue ads at the State level.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL).

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, this is one of the most important parts of the Shays-Meehan bill is that the sham ads, and they really are that, would be exposed for what they are.

I do not have any problem with people wanting to speak out. That is the First Amendment. That is what this country is founded upon. It is one of the key principles that makes our country so free. But we ought to be clear about where those ads are coming from. We ought to be clear about who is paying for those ads.

I think that is not an abrogation of the First Amendment. It is not restricting people's right to free speech. But it is letting all of the voters know where these resources are coming from so they can make an informed choice. I think there is nothing more crucial with Shays-Meehan than getting a handle on all of this money that comes from outside the system right now.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Washington (Mr. BAIRD), who is also the President of our freshman class.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to discuss an issue which, if we ask pollsters, they will tell us it does not poll high. Education, fighting crime, Social Security, that is all the American people care about. Those things are absolutely critical, and we have spoken on those issues here as well.

□ 1530

But if this body is to be able to address those critical issues, we need to give our Members time and we need to give them the freedom to speak their mind without fear of political attack.

This is my first term in Congress. I was sent here by the good people of southwest Washington to represent their views. Southwest Washington is a beautiful area. It is a rural district as well as urban-suburban. I am here to speak their voice. We should be here to speak the voices of our people, not the voice of money. That is why campaign reform is so important.

People across this country are losing faith in the political system. Young people are saying their vote and their voice do not matter. People are saying they do not need to turn out and vote, and we are seeing voter turnouts below 50 percent, even below 30 and 25 percent in primaries.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday our freshman class submitted a letter to the Speaker's office signed by 22 of our 23 Democratic freshmen, and what we called for was early consideration of meaningful campaign finance reform. Early consideration. We cannot wait until the end of this year or until the end of this session of Congress and then say, gosh, we tried, but we ran out of time.

We must address this issue early for two reasons. Early, to give us time for meaningful, informative debate; early, so that we show we are sincere in this effort; and also early so that we have time to enact some of these laws to save the integrity of the next campaign season.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to see any more campaigns of the kind that we have seen in recent years, with vast independent expenditures, with scorched earth policies of saying anything and doing anything to be elected. We have seen too much of that. It is poisoning the political process; it is souring people in the belief that their voice and their vote matters.

During the 1997-98 election cycle, the national political parties raised \$193 million in soft money. That is right, my colleagues, \$193 million. I have to ask myself, how else might we have spent that money in this country? Could we have put it towards improving our education system? Could we have put it towards helping to reduce crime in our communities? Could we have helped senior citizens pay for their housing? Could we have improved the environment? There are innumerable uses we could put \$193 million towards, but we put it towards advertising.

We have had some laws that have attempted to deal with the problem of campaign funding, but existing loopholes have actually made the system worse, not better. Last year, 252 Members of this body voted to pass substantial reform legislation. Now, the Shays-Meehan bill may not have been perfect, but it was the best that we had before us, and I personally have signed on as a cosponsor of that bill because I think it is reasonable and it is responsible.

We have to do everything possible to maintain the public trust. Reforming campaign finance laws is not a Democratic problem, it is not a Republican problem, it is an American problem. It is a threat to our constitution if we do not achieve it, and we need to work now to do that.

I would like to speak to a couple of elements of the Shays-Meehan bill that make common sense, and I firmly believe if we ask the general public, the folks who sent us here to represent them, if these proposals make sense, they would encourage us to put them forward.

First, and my colleague mentioned it, a soft money ban. When we receive in the mail every single day during the campaign's final weeks a letter attacking one person or attacking another person, and at the bottom, as the gentleman from New Mexico said, it has some innocuous sounding name suggesting that that fine group of responsible citizens voluntarily put small contributions together to have a voice, that sounds reasonable. But that is not what happens. In fact, huge, virtually unlimited donations can come in and they can be spent on so-called issue advocacy ads.

Let me share with my colleagues what some of those issue advocacy ads do. In our campaign, one issue advocacy group spent over \$12,000 for a single 30 second advertisement. That is correct, \$12,000 for 30 seconds. The ad was later denounced as deliberately false and misleading, but they continued to run it. Now, \$12,000 for 30 seconds comes down to \$400 a second. Four hundred dollars a second to disseminate disruptive, deceptive and mean spirited information. Misinformation. That is wrong, Mr. Speaker, and we need to change it.

The Shays-Meehan bill before us this year would ban soft money and would set hard dollar contribution limits for the party so that we know where the money is coming from, and it has a meaningful ceiling.

The Shays-Meehan bill would recognize sham issue ads for what they truly are. They are campaign ads. It would say that if that group identifies a person in an advertisement, and it is within 60 days of an election, by golly, that is not information, that is political advertising, and they will fall under the restrictions that restrict political advertising.

It would say that any ad that contains unambiguous support or attacks

on a position of a politician would also fall under the guidelines of campaign financing and, therefore, under the restrictions.

It would improve FEC disclosure. We should not have to spend days and weeks after an election to find out who contributed to a candidate or who spent money on issue ads during the election.

It would establish a commission to study further reforms to our campaign system.

It would also limit and restrict foreign soft money contributions.

It would restrict further franking. Franking, as a means of informing the public, is a wonderful thing, but if it happens just a few weeks before an election, and currently I believe the limit is about 60 days, if it happens a few weeks before an election, it may well be political in nature.

The Shays-Meehan bill would limit the amount of money that wealthy candidates can contribute. When the young people who visit us here every day look down on this floor and say to themselves, I would like to be a representative someday, they should say, I would like to be a representative because I believe so strongly in this democracy; I believe in the issues I care about. That is what should bring them here. It should not be a question of how much money they have to raise or how wealthy their friends are. It should be a question of how decent their values are, how strong their commitment to this country is, how much they know about the issues, and how strongly they will fight to make this a better Nation. That is what should get them into Congress, and not just how much money they are able to raise.

The Shays-Meehan bill would establish a clearinghouse for information from the FEC and it would strengthen penalties for violations.

Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. UDALL), was elected by our class to lead our freshman class's efforts to make campaign finance reform a top priority issue in this congressional session. He is doing an outstanding job in that. We are united as a freshman class in the commitment to campaign finance reform being addressed early in this session. I stand with my friend from New Mexico and with our freshman class in a commitment to keep bringing this issue forward until we pass meaningful legislation.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) very much.

One of the issues that the gentleman mentioned, and I hope we can carry on a little discussion about some of these issues that the gentleman has raised here, the first one is this issue of people being discouraged from going into elective politics.

I have traveled throughout my Congressional District and gone into high schools and taught high school classes and tried to talk about what it means

to be a public servant and why we need good public servants. And, in fact, I have heard people say if we do not have the best and the brightest going into our governmental arena, then we relegate ourselves to second class leadership.

I think that is really the thrust of what the gentleman is saying there. The gentleman, in a very powerful way, is saying if we change the system, we may open it up to a whole new group of leaders out there that will say, look, this is a cleaner system, this is a better system, this is a system that I believe I can stand up and be a part of.

I was wondering, does the gentleman see those kinds of things in Washington, in his district, where he thinks there would be a lot more interest in terms of individuals?

Mr. BAIRD. Absolutely. I cannot tell my colleague the numbers of people, fine, decent, upstanding people, who would make outstanding representatives at all levels of government, who come to me and say, what is it like? I have to tell them that I believe being a representative to the United States Congress is the highest privilege, the highest honor one could ever aspire to, but it is a tremendous responsibility as well.

That is the positive side. What I hate to have to tell people, but I do, because it is, unfortunately, the truth, that if they want to serve today in the United States Congress, and if they are from a district that is competitive, they need to be prepared not to study the issues as well as they wish they could, not to have as much time as they wish they had to meet the people, not to spend time with their family sometimes, but that they need to be prepared, regrettably, to attach themselves to a telephone and become basically a phone solicitor.

That is a tragedy. It is nothing short of a tragedy. When Jefferson and Madison and Mason and George Washington and Benjamin Franklin, the Founding Fathers of this country, were establishing this great Nation, they did not envision, in their wildest imagination, that good people, people who they inspire every day by their example, would be tied to a telephone asking for money. They did not envision that all the wonderful people who care about the democracy would feel that dollars sometimes mean more than votes. That is wrong. It should not be that way.

I want to compliment the people who do contribute, the donors who, most of the time, are not asking for anything. I cannot tell my colleague how many folks have said that they are contributing to my campaign because they believe in me as a person. They are not asking for anything except for me to do my best for our country. We should not insult them. We should not demean them. We should praise them for being active participants. But we should also honor their contributions by setting reasonable limits like those proposed in Shays-Meehan.

I talked to a woman once who was on Social Security, a fixed income, and she said she knew how much we have to raise to run for Congress and she wished she could give it all to me. She said she would offer to give \$5, but she would be embarrassed because she knew that I may have to raise \$1 million and that I would not get there very fast if I went at it \$5 at a time.

I was happy to accept her contribution. That \$5 meant a lot of me. Proportionately, it was probably a greater portion of her income than a lot of folks, and it should not be overwhelmed by a tide of soft money. It should not be overwhelmed by a tide of enormous contributions. It should stand as her contribution to the democratic process.

We need to ensure, through legislation like this, that everyone's voice matters in this process. The gentleman is exactly right, we have to free our candidates up, we have to reinspire a sense of hope and civility and civic pride that once led people to say, I would like to run for political office and serve this country. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. One of the parts, and I think the gentleman touched on it, that I believe is a particularly valuable part of this bill, is the setting up of a blue ribbon panel to study the entire campaign finance system. Those of us here in the House that have worked on this issue realize that we probably need some people to take a big comprehensive look at the whole system, spend 18 months and come back to us with some of the issues that we are not addressing here.

The gentleman and I both know that in a campaign today 80-85 percent of our money is spent on television. Well, these are airwaves that are owned by the public. The broadcasters and media people get these licenses. In Britain they have great debates when they enter into an election. They are all publicly televised at no cost.

I think there are parts of this bill where we could make the bill stronger, but I believe the way to do it is to have this big broad commission go out and do their very best to find out how we can get back to work in this body, how we can lessen the impact of special interests, how we can do everything we can to make sure that the people's voices are heard in our democracy.

I think this commission idea, although it is not mentioned that much, I think is a good one, of getting citizens to go out and report back to us.

Mr. BAIRD. I agree. Absolutely. The Shays-Meehan bill is a start. It is a first step, an important and essential first step, and one we should take today or tomorrow. We should not wait until the end of this year.

But there are other things we can do, and the gentleman raises an interesting point. Throughout my campaign, for example, I said that we needed to have informative voter pamphlets. In our State of Washington a candidate

for the United States Congress is allowed 250 words in the State voter pamphlets. Two hundred and fifty words, with critical issues like national defense, health care, Social Security, our children's education, stopping crime.

With those issues on the table, we get 250 words to condense a lifetime of community service and teaching and training and experience. Two hundred and fifty words. We need informative voter pamphlets. We need to work with the media. And I think that is part of what the gentleman is addressing.

In our district we have some very, very responsible broadcast stations, stations that do grant candidates time; that do air debates. We need to encourage those stations, and we need to encourage the viewers to not just dive for the remote and say, oh my goodness, it is a political debate, I have to watch something else.

□ 1545

Because if they do that, candidates have no choice but to change them with advertising, and a 30-second advertisement will not tell them as much as a 1-hour debate. So we have got to encourage the stations that do provide coverage. We need to work, I believe, in our public schools, and it is something I am going to work through and throughout my life in Congress. And here is what I would like to see us do.

I would like to see us consider every senior in this class getting an American Government course which talks about their personal responsibility to the country, which talks about how the transition from high school is not just the end of drudgery, as some view it, but it is their transition to the most sacred responsibility a person in a democracy has, that of citizen.

If we combine those informative voters pamphlets, meaningful broadcast information, better public civics education in our public schools, we could, in addition to things like Shays-Meehan, reinvigorate a vibrant and vital political debate, a debate on which a democracy depends. And so we need exactly, as you said, to strengthen that commission, to let it do its job and provide comprehensive recommendations for further improvements in this process.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. BAIRD, you mention the point of the responsible broadcasters that are out there, and I really believe that many of us have seen in our congressional districts many responsible broadcasters. And I think over the 8 to 9 years that I have been in public service, I have seen broadcasters step forward with free time and say right near an election, "we are going to give you 5 minutes completely unrestricted and you can say whatever you want." Now, that is a very I think commendable effort on their part.

And there is another proposal they have come up with, this idea of banking credits for television time and in-

volving the political process and the electoral process in that. So I would like to hear their ideas as to how is the best way to do this. When I spent 5 weeks in England during one of their elections, all of it was on television. The entire public was engaged. And it was not on 30-second ads. It was on real debates, where men and women were discussing the direction of the country, they were discussing what are their values and what direction do they want to move in. And it was a very stimulating debate. And as somebody that was not even allowed to vote, they would walk into one of their establishments and they would be right in the middle of a big political debate to where Britain should go.

So we need to try to get to the point where we bring our elections back to really this idea of a marketplace of ideas, a true discussion, involving the public, bringing them in. And we are not doing that right now. The 30-second commercials I think are turning people off. They are saying this is not a part, this is not a part of me; this is some other debate taking place over there.

Mr. BAIRD. I sometimes think we need to pose to the American people a basic choice, and the choice would be this. Do they want people who are going to represent them to spend their time on the telephone raising huge amounts of money so they can run 30-second advertisements or do they want them to come visit them in town meetings? Do they want them to be studying the issues, to be listening to them, to be meeting with their colleagues to try to propose constructive progressive legislation?

I personally believe that there is no question people want us to do the latter. But until we have campaign finance reform and until the American public feels that they have a voice and a responsibility in the political process, we will not have the kind of dialogue that my colleague has described. That is why I think Shays-Meehan is so important and it is why we need to dedicate ourselves to that.

Let me, if I might, address one other issue that I feel real strongly about. In a sense, people might say we are foolish to be even talking about campaign finance reform. We are incumbent now for goodness sake. The incumbent potentially would have all the advantages of a system where large dollar contributions come flying in because of our position here.

In some ways, we are saying we are willing to set down our advantage, what might be a financial advantage, for the good of the country, we are willing to say we are prepared to compete on a level playing field, we are prepared to clean up the process. So that, for the good of everybody, we have got to stop saying in this body, how will this legislation impact our opportunity to win the next election and we have got to start asking, how will this legislation work for the good of the country.

That is what it is about with campaign finance reform. It should not be a partisan issue. And if there are special-interest groups pressuring Members of one party or the other and saying, "you must not support campaign finance reform or we will come after you," which I know to be a fact, there are special-interest groups doing that, those special-interest groups that do that are the problem, and Members who feel pressured need to speak out about that.

It is not right for people to threaten Members by saying, "we will attack you with financial resources if you try to change the campaign finance system." That is symptomatic of the problem, and we need to speak out vigorously about that and the public needs to speak out and I think they need to ask themselves where their Member was on the issue of campaign reform. That is why we are here today.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more with the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) in terms of leveling the playing field. I very much believe that the imbalance that is there with the fundraising, with the ability of an incumbent to buy incredible numbers of 30-second ads, it perverts the whole system. And we need to try for a system where when there are two candidates or three candidates, or however many there are in a particular primary or general election, that they do have equal time and that they have the ability to get their ideas across.

The 30-second spot, although it may be a good medium to convey an idea, is so restricting in terms of allowing an individual to really articulate their vision for the country, where they want to take the country. And so in structuring this, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) put together a bill that I think is going to level the playing field, create a commission where they can come back and tell us other ways that we can try to make sure the challengers have a true opportunity to get their ideas out. And I think that is what we are all about here in terms of our freshman class, and members of our freshman class that have signed on, is saying, we have been through it, we know how it works, we need to reform it and we need to reform it right now.

Mr. BAIRD. People have said that the legislative process is like making sausage, it might taste good at the end but we do not want to see how it is made. I think people are all too familiar and believe that the process is made unfortunately through contributions.

What we are trying to do here is say, and I want to emphasize this, the bill that we are putting forward that the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN) have put forward and in our class and my colleague and myself have endorsed does not say we have to stop all money. Because,

quite frankly, we do need financial resources. Campaigns to reach 500,000 people with their message do cost money. But it says the way we raise the money needs to be reformed. It says the playing field needs to be level. It says enormous special-interest contributions and thinly disguised attack ads need to be eliminated. It says they need to have access to information about who is contributing so they can see the groups they agree with or disagree with support this candidate, they can see if the group says, "we are citizens for a wonderful, happy economy and gracious environment," or some such thing, who the heck are those people? Because oftentimes the names they choose are different than the agenda they would have us believe through their titles.

That is why we need the reform. We have got to have transparency. We have got to have a level playing field. We have got to have reasonable limits. And we have got to set our candidates free from the drudgery of having to spend their lives on the telephone. We get to talk to a lot of nice folks when we do that and there is merit to that. And I have met some wonderful people through the process of politics so far, but I will tell my colleagues that I would most of all like to meet with them and just listen to their issues and never have to have them or myself worried about the proverbial pitch for money, because that is a blight on our system. And the more we can do to reduce that, the more we can do to level the playing field for the small and individual donors, to limit soft money, to ban soft money used in political advertising, the better off we will be.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. Mr. BAIRD, the idea that people do not care about this, the idea that somehow the electorate is not concerned about the issue of how our campaigns are financed is one that when people throw that idea out I just instinctively believe that they have not been around, they have not heard what people have said. Because when I ask people, "what would you do to change the system?" they say, "no gifts at all, no corporate giving, very small amounts of money." They do not even like how high the amount is now. "Get the money completely out of politics." Those are the kinds of comments I hear. And that is clearly where they are coming from, and they want us to reform.

Mr. Speaker, we have here the gentlewoman from the great State of Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY). She would like to join our debate I believe, and I yield to her.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, representing the State of Illinois was the great Senator Paul Simon just for two terms. He decided not to run again, and one of the reasons he decided not to run again was that he knew that he was going to have to raise an obscene amount of money in order to be a viable candidate for the United States Senate.

Paul Simon has been a paragon of integrity, a person who has represented the highest in public service, and decided not to run. And he would tell a story during the campaign about how, after a long day on the trail, he would come back to his hotel room and there would be a stack of messages, all those pink slips that we all get telling us who to call back, and he would look through that list and among them would be maybe four from people or PACs that have contributed a lot of money. And he said, you know, I just want to ask you, who do you think after a long day it was that I felt a priority to call back? Now, he was making an admission about how campaigns and how running for office really works. He said, yeah, I called those big givers back because, without the millions of dollars that it took to run for the United States Senate, all of those things that I believe in and that my constituents stand for, I would not be able to be there in the Senate. And it was partly that that drove him from office. I think what Paul Simon was saying is that money to the extent that it is a factor in politics imperils our democracy.

Now, we have a number of opportunities this session to address this issue. I know that the Shays-Meehan bill will be up again, a bill that deals with the question of soft money, a way to get around campaign financing rules, and I support that. But there are other options too that I think eventually we are going to have to get to, the clean elections, clean money proposals, which essentially say that we are going to just take that special-interest money, those big bucks, out of politics.

Now, we looked in the State of Illinois at how much it would cost each Illinois family per year to pay for all of the Federal elections within our State. And do my colleagues know what we found? It would cost about \$5 per family per year to fund the elections at the level that they are being funded now, which is very high. We are talking millions of dollars per election. Well, it seems to me that 5 bucks a family per year to buy back our Government is a bargain.

Why don't people vote? Why don't they participate? Because they have a sense that there is not a place at the table unless they put their money down and they have bought that place at the table. And all too often that is true and certainly in terms of access to elected officials. And that was that story that Paul Simon was sadly telling and all too often I think in the outcome of public policy decisions.

□ 1600

Do people care about it? Do they care about how much they pay in their utility bills? Do they care who is polluting their air? Do they care whether or not their schools are of a good quality? All of these issues are influenced by big-money players in the political arena. Those are issues that they care about.

Fundamentally I think we are never going to get to deciding on the basis of what is right, what is wrong, what is best for people unless we take the element of big money out of our election campaigns.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. I thank the gentlewoman very much for those excellent comments.

Mr. Speaker, one of the issues that either one of my colleagues may want to engage me in, is an important issue. There were people in the past that have shone the light. The gentlewoman mentioned Paul Simon from her great State. I know two individuals, one, Senator Proxmire from Wisconsin who took the attitude that he was not going to take any money, and he sent money back, actually. What he would do is every time he would go out to Wisconsin, he would get out at the professional football games, stand in line and shake 40,000 hands. He figured that was the way to get reelected. Back in those days, he did a good job of it and people loved him. And Representative Pat Williams, I think, was asked when he left Congress what he was going to miss, and he said that the one thing he had never gotten into was making telephone calls for fund-raising. He said, "Somebody else can do that."

Clearly we are in a different time because of the mistrust and because of all of the issue ads and everything else that is out there, but we need to try and move back, I think, to the point where there is more of that. Their real purpose in doing that was saying, "I want to focus on my job. I don't want to take one minute away from my job."

Mr. BAIRD. Let me share with my colleagues an example actually from our recent experience. We had a very expensive campaign, I will admit it, because we were getting attacked heavily, one of the number-one targets in the whole country. But we also had a grassroots campaign. That is what we need to have more of. We had 1,100 volunteers in the field on the day of the election, 1,100 people going around the district working telephones, saying why they cared so much about that election. I know my good friend from Illinois had a similar organization. That is politics at its best. Politics at its best is people working in the field for people they believe. Politics at its worst is when people pay telephone solicitors to call with smear campaigns. Politics at its worst are last-minute \$100,000, \$200,000 and \$300,000 TV attack ads.

What I am hoping we can do is inspire the young people who come watch us each day and watch us on TV and who are in our schools today to be a part of politics at its best. This bill will help reduce the impact of politics at its worst and maybe inspire people to do more.

I know my good friend from Illinois has had similar work with people in the field.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. During the election campaign, I spent about 25 hours a

week on the telephone, as they say, dialing for dollars, asking people if they would contribute to my campaign. Those are 25 hours a week that I could have been learning more about issues, attending meetings with community representatives, out shaking hands, going to grocery stores, meeting with constituents, learning about the real issues that affect people in my district and not calling name after name of people who might be able to contribute to the campaigns. But worse than that, it seems to me, what they want in a Member of Congress, when we reach for our voting card to put it in a slot and vote on an issue, I think what the voters want us to be thinking about is them, what is good for them, not making a calculation in our minds, "If I vote yes, which of my major contributors is going to be upset?" Or "how am I going to explain this to somebody who has given me a lot of money?"

I know from being in the State legislature that unfortunately these kinds of calculations are made. I think anyone who says otherwise is simply not telling the truth about how it works in terms of money. And so I think that it is not only the candidate's time but also the candidate's vote that is at stake here.

Mr. BAIRD. If I could echo that a little bit. One of the things that is frustrating about some of these discussions of reform, people have come and said that the politicians are corrupt. People need to understand that I do not know a single person who says, "Gosh, I'm so excited because there's 5 hours of call time on my schedule today."

We need to understand that money does not come to the candidates. It goes to your campaign fund, which then typically goes almost directly to a TV or radio station or direct mail house. The people who are running for office, the people I have met in this great body, are decent people. They are here because they care about the system. They do the fund-raising side not because they like that, not because they line their own pockets but because they are willing to endure the humiliation and the drudgery and the frustration in order to get here and have a voice for the people of their State. We need to be very careful when we talk about this to not tear down this House and not tear down our colleagues because they are good, decent people. The system of funding may be corroded but the people involved are not corrupt people. I want to make sure what we do is we free them from that drudgery and we free them from that stigma and that stain that other people might attach to it.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. I would certainly echo that. I would also say that the gentleman raises a good point about the cost of media and the idea that radio time, that TV time which eats up so many of the dollars that are raised in campaigns, if we could get more contributions from the public airwaves toward campaigns, if we could

have some free air time on radio and television, that it would certainly help ease the need for campaign donations.

Mr. UDALL of New Mexico. The issue of the individuals, the Members of Congress, that are here and how they relate to this system, I do not think there is any doubt that we have people that are here that are well-intentioned, they care about their constituencies, they care very much about their congressional districts, and they are caught in a bad system. They are caught in a bad system. That is why I am so proud of our freshman class for stepping up to the plate. The freshman class that preceded us did the same thing.

Members from both sides of the aisle last August, in 1998, 252 Members, voted for this bill that all of us want to see passed today. I think that sends a very strong message that we want change, we want people to be heard, we want truly to open up the system and get back to ideas rather than money.

If there are no additional comments from either the gentleman from Washington or the gentlewoman from Illinois, let me at this point just close by saying that I am very, very proud of our freshman class for stepping up to the plate on this issue. I am very proud of the gentleman from Washington for his leadership on this issue as the president of our freshman class, and the gentlewoman from Illinois. I know that she has also become a leader on this issue and I compliment her on that and say that I think with all of us working together and reaching across the aisle, I really and truly think we are going to get this done, we are going to get it done early and get it over to the other body. I think we are going to see progress on this issue this year. I thank both my colleagues for their participation.

PROMOTING LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, one of the benefits of a livable community is that it provides a setting that high technology industries can flourish. Indeed, it works both ways. While a livable community attracts high technology, high technology can in fact provide the support for a more livable community, support via a more educated workforce, support in terms of having the financial resources that that community can pay for growth and development, support by having a workforce that is intensely sensitive to the requirements of livable communities.

This has had a tremendous impact on our national economy. It is common knowledge to most Members of this body that high technology has been the fastest growing area of our national

economic growth, over 4 million jobs, and it approaches almost \$1 trillion in terms of our gross national product. In my State of Oregon, the effects have been even more profound. We are known, for example, for agriculture and wood products. Yet technology-based industries in the State of Oregon now provide twice the economic impact as agriculture and forest products combined. It provides an average wage that is almost twice the State average. There is every indication as far as the future is concerned that the impact nationally and in the State of Oregon in the years ahead is going to be even more profound. Yet the question is, how do we take maximum advantage of this growing economic and sociological phenomenon.

It would seem to me that it is important for the Federal Government to have in place a series of policies that promote the full implementation of this opportunity. There has been significant indirect Federal support through the research and development tax credit that has helped invest in the future as far as these industries are concerned. Again, just taking the impact on a small State like Oregon where 8 percent of the total revenue is tied up in research and development, well over \$1.3 billion.

But it is time for us in the Federal Government to get real about what our policy is towards stability in the high-tech industry. We have had in place for years a temporary investment tax credit that we approve a year at a time. We are going to extend the investment tax credit, once again due to expire. I hope that this year is the last time we go through this charade of the 1-year extension. We know that it is critical for the future of the high-tech industry. We know that it is a benefit that is well-placed, that pays dividends far in excess of the amount of benefit that is granted. Indeed, there is every indication that, according to one estimate, over \$41 billion of new investment would be unleashed by making the investment tax credit permanent. Nobody in the private sector, however, is going to make the long-term investments based on our good intentions. Even though we know we are going to extend it, even though they are certain we probably will extend it, it simply is not prudent for people to put millions of dollars, tens of millions of dollars or more on the line based on our good intention. We have seen train wrecks on the floor of this Chamber before.

I hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will come together quickly to make clear that we are going to make this a permanent extension. Livable communities, I have suggested time and again on the floor of this Chamber, require not so much rules and regulations as they require the Federal Government to be a constructive partner with State and local governments, with private citizens and business to help promote livable communities. The stability that would come from a perma-

nent extension of the investment tax credit would be a very tangible expression of that stable Federal partnership, and I hope we are about that business soon in this congressional session.

MANAGED CARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GANSKE. Madam Speaker, tomorrow on the other side of the Capitol, in the Senate, debate begins on managed care reform legislation.

I would like to take my colleagues back to May 30, 1996, when a small, nervous woman testified before the House Committee on Commerce. Her testimony, Madam Speaker, was buried in the fourth panel at the end of a long day about the abuses of managed care. The reporters were gone, the television cameras had packed up, most of the original crowd had dispersed.

□ 1615

Madam Speaker, she should have been the first witness that day, not one of the last. She told about the choices that managed care companies and self-insured plans are making every day when they determine medical necessity.

This woman, Linda Peeno, had been a claims reviewer for several HMOs. Here is her story:

"I wish to begin by making a public confession. In the spring of 1987, as a physician, I caused the death of a man. Although this was known to many people, I have not been taken before any court of law or called to account for this in any professional or public forum. In fact, just the opposite occurred. I was rewarded for this. It brought me an improved reputation in my job and contributed to my advancement afterwards. Not only did I demonstrate I could do what was expected of me, I exemplified the good company doctor. I saved half a million dollars."

Madam Speaker, as she spoke, a hush came over the room. The representatives of the trade associations who were still there averted their eyes. The audience shifted uncomfortably in their seats, both the gripped and alarmed by her story.

Her voice became husky, and I could see tears in her eyes. Her anguish over harming patients as a managed care reviewer had caused this woman to come forth and bear her soul.

She continued:

"Since that day I have lived with this act and many others eating into my heart and soul. For me a physician is a professional charged with the care or healing of his or her fellow human beings. The primary ethical norm is: Do no harm. I did worse; I caused death."

She went on:

"Instead of using a clumsy, bloody weapon, I used the simplest, cleanest of

tools: my words. This man died because I denied him a necessary operation to save his heart. I felt little pain or remorse at the time. The man's faceless distance soothed my conscience. Like a skilled soldier, I was trained for this moment. When any moral qualms arose I was to remember I am not denying care, I am only denying payment."

Madam Speaker, by this time the trade association representatives were staring at the floor, the Congressmen who had spoken on behalf of the HMOs were distinctly uncomfortable and the staff, several of whom subsequently became representatives of HMO trade organizations, were thanking God that this witness came at the end of the day.

Dr. Peeno's testimony continued:

"At the time this helped me avoid any sense of responsibility for my decision. Now I am no longer willing to accept the escapist reasoning that allowed me to rationalize this action. I accept my responsibility now for this man's death as well as for the immeasurable pain and suffering many other decisions of mine caused."

She then listed the many ways managed care health plans deny care to patients, but she emphasized one particular issue: the right to decide what care is medically necessary.

She said:

"There is one last activity that I think deserves a special place on this list, and this is what I call the smart bomb of cost containment, and that is medical necessities denials. Even when medical criteria is used, it is rarely developed in any kind of standard traditional clinical process."

She continued:

"It is rarely standardized across the field. The criteria is rarely available for prior review by the physicians or the members of the plan. We have enough experience from history to demonstrate the consequences of secretive, unregulated systems that go awry."

After exposing her own transgressions, she closed by urging everyone in the room to examine their own consciences:

"One can only wonder how much pain, suffering and death we will have before we have the courage to change our course. Personally, I have decided even one death is too much for me."

Madam Speaker, the hearing room at that time was stone cold quiet. The chairman mumbled, "Thank you, Doctor."

Linda Peeno could have rationalized her decisions, as many do. Oh, I was just working within guidelines, or I was just following orders, or, you know, we have to save resources, or this is not about treatment, it is really just about benefits.

Madam Speaker, Dr. Peeno refused to continue this denial, and she will do penance for her sins the rest of her life by exposing the dirty little secret of HMOs determining medical necessity.

Madam Speaker, if there is only one thing to consider before our colleagues

vote on patient protection legislation, I urge our colleagues to consider the following:

Before we vote on any patient protection legislation, we must keep in mind the fact that no amount of procedural protection or schemes of external review can help patients if insurers are legislatively given broad powers to determine what standards will be used to make decisions about coverage. As Dr. Peeno so poignantly observed, insurers now routinely make decisions by determining what goods and services they will pay for. The difference between clinical decisions about medical necessary care and decisions about insurance coverage are especially blurred, and, Madam Speaker, because all but the wealthy rely on insurers, the power of insurers to determine coverage gives them the power to dictate professional standards of care.

Make no mistake. Along with the question of health plan liability, the determination of who should decide when health care is medically necessary is the key issue in patient protection legislation.

Contrary to the claims of HMOs that this is some new concept, for over 200 years most private insurers and third party payers have viewed as medically necessary those products or services provided in accordance with prevailing standards of medical practice, quote, unquote. This is the definition that I use in my own managed care reform bill, the Managed Care Reform Act of 1999, and the courts have been sensitive to the fact that insurers have a conflict of interest because they stand to gain financially from denying care and have used clinically-derived professional standards of care, the courts have, to reverse insurers' attempts to deviate from those standards. That is why it is so important that managed care reform legislation include an independent appeals panel with no financial interest in the outcome. A fair review process utilizing clinical standards of care guarantees that the decision of the review board is made without regard to the financial interests of either the HMO or the physician. On the other hand, if the review board has to use the health plan's definition of medically necessary, there is no such guarantee.

Now, Madam Speaker, in response to a growing body of case law and the HMOs' own need to demonstrate profitability to their shareholders insurers are now writing contracts that threaten even this minimal level of consumer protection. They are writing contracts in which standards of medical necessity are not only separated from standards of good practice but are also essentially not subject to review.

Here is one example of many of a health plan's definition of medically necessary services. This is directly from the language of a contract from an HMO:

"Medical necessity means the shortest, least expensive or least intense level of treatment, care or service ren-

dered or supply provided as determined by us, the health plan."

Contracts like this demonstrate that some health plans are manipulating the definition of medical necessity to deny appropriate patient care by arbitrarily linking it to saving money, not the patient's medical needs.

Now on the surface some might say, so what is wrong with the least expensive treatment? Well, let me give my colleagues one example out of thousands I could cite:

Before I came to Congress, I was a reconstructive surgeon. I treated children with cleft palets, a fissure on the roof of the mouth. Clinical standards of care would determine that the best treatment is surgical correction, but under this HMO's definition, the one that says shortest, least expensive, the plan could limit coverage to a piece of plastic to fill the hole in the roof of that patient's mouth. After all, that plastic obturator would be cheaper. However, instead of condemning children to a lifetime of using a messy prosthesis, the proper treatment, reconstruction using the child's own tissue, would give that child the best chance at normal speech and a normal life, and let me warn my colleagues paradoxically insurers stand to benefit from misguided legislative changes that can displace case law.

Last year legislation passed this House and the GOP bill in the Senate would have granted insurers the explicit power to define medical necessity without regard to current standards of medical practice. This would have been accomplished by allowing them to classify as medically unnecessary any procedures not specifically found to be necessary by the insurer's own technical review panel. The Senate bill also would have given insurers the power to determine what evidence would be relevant in evaluating claims for coverage and would have permitted insurers to classify some coverage decisions as exempt from administrative review.

Madam Speaker, I know that many of our colleagues who supported those bills last year had no idea of the implication of the medical necessity provisions in them.

□ 1630

That is why I hope my friends in both the House and the Senate are listening. As I said, tomorrow the Senate starts to address this issue.

Specifically, insurers now want to move away from clinical standards of care applied to particular patients to standards linking medical necessity to what are called population studies.

On the surface, this may seem to be scientific and rational. However, as a physician who is a former medical reviewer myself and who worked with many insurers, large and small, let me explain why I think it is critical that we stick with medical necessity as defined by clinical standard of care.

First, sole reliance on broad standards from generalized evidence is not

good medical practice. I will explain these. Second, there are practical limits to designing studies that can answer all clinical questions. Third, most studies are not of sufficient scientific quality to justify overruling clinical judgment.

Let me explain these points, and I also recommend an article on this by Rosenbaum in the January 21, 1999, edition of the New England Journal of Medicine.

First, while it may seem counterintuitive, it is not good medicine to solely use what are called outcomes-based studies of medical necessity, even when the science is rigorous. Let me explain why.

The reason is because the choice of the outcome is inherently value laden. The medical reviewer for the HMO is likely, as shown by the above-mentioned contract, to consider cost the essential value.

What about quality? As a surgeon, I treated many patients with broken fingers merely by reducing the fracture and splinting the finger and, Madam Speaker, for most patients this inexpensive treatment would restore adequate function.

What about the musician, the piano player who needs a better range of motion? For that patient, surgery might be necessary.

Which outcome should be the basis for the decision about insurance coverage? Playing the piano or routine functioning?

My point is this: Taking care of patients requires a lot of variation and a lot of individualization. Definitions of medical necessity have to be flexible enough to take into account the needs of each patient. One-size-fits-all outcomes make irrelevant the doctor's knowledge of the individual patient and is bad medicine, period.

Second, there are practical limitations on basing medical necessity on what is called generalized evidence, particularly as applied by HMOs.

Much of medicine is a result of collective experience, and many basic medical treatments have not been studied rigorously. Furthermore, aside from a handful of procedures that are not explicitly covered, most care is not specifically defined in health plans because the number of procedures and the circumstances of their application is limitless.

In addition, by their very nature, many controlled clinical trials study treatments in isolation; whereas physicians need to know the benefits of one type of treatment over another when they are taking care of an individual patient. Prospective randomized comparison studies, on the other hand, are very expensive. Given the enormous number of procedures and individual circumstances, if coverage is limited to only those that have scientifically sound generalized outcomes, care could be denied for almost all conditions.

Come to think of it, Madam Speaker, maybe that is why HMOs are so keen to

get away from prevailing standards of care.

Third, the validity of HMO guidelines and how they are used is open to question. Medical directors of HMOs were asked to rank the sources of information they used to make medical decisions. Industry guidelines, generated by the trade associations representing health plans, were ranked ahead of information from national experts, government documents and NIH consensus conferences. The most highly respected source, medical journals, was used less than 60 percent of the time.

Industry guidelines are frequently written by a firm by the name of Milliman and Robertson, a strategy shop for the HMO industry. This is the same firm that championed drive-through deliveries and outpatient mastectomies. Many times these practice guidelines are not grounded in science but are cookbook recipes derived by actuaries to reduce health care costs.

Here are two examples of the errors of their guidelines. In reference to outpatient mastectomies, a National Cancer Institute study released in June found that women receiving outpatient mastectomies face significantly higher risks of being rehospitalized and have a higher risk of surgery-related complications like infections and blood clots. In regard to drive-through deliveries, in 1997, a study published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* showed that babies discharged within a day of birth faced increase risk of developing jaundice, dehydration and dangerous infections.

Objectivity of medical decision-making requires that the results of studies be open to peer review, yet much of the decision-making by HMOs is based on unpublished proprietary and unexamined methods and data. Such secret and potentially biased guidelines simply cannot be called scientific.

This is not to say that outcomes-based studies do not make up a part of how clinical standards of care are determined. They do, but we are all familiar with the ephemeral nature of new scientific studies such as those on the supposed dangers of alar. Remember the apple scare a few years ago?

Clinical standard of care, the standard that we should use for medical necessity, does take into account valid and replicable studies in the peer-reviewed literature, as well as the results of professional consensus conferences, practice guidelines based on government-funded studies and guidelines prepared by insurers that have been determined to have been free of conflict of interest, but most importantly, they also include the patient's individual health and medical information and the clinical judgment of the treating physician.

Madam Speaker, Congress should pass legislation defining this standard of medical necessity because, one, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, ERISA, shields plans from the

consequences of most decisions about medical necessity. Two, under ERISA, patients generally can only recover the value of the benefits denied. Three, even this limited remedy is being eroded by insurance contracts that give insurers the authority to make decisions about medical necessity based on questionable evidence.

To ensure these protections, Congress must provide patients with a speedy external review of all coverage decisions, not merely those that insurers decide are subject to review. It is time for Congress to defuse the smart bomb of HMOs.

Madam Speaker, the issues of managed care reform should go from the drawing board to the signing ceremony this year. Last year, I joined with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and offered the Patients' Bill of Rights as an amendment on the House floor. While I regret that it did not pass, there may have been at least one good thing about that. In the last few weeks, many HMOs have announced double digit premium increases. We can be sure that if the Patients' Bill of Rights had passed, there would be a whole lot of HMO fingers pointing at Congress blaming us now for those skyrocketing premiums which are really due to HMO mismanagement.

I think it is important to remember why it is so important that Congress should pass HMO reform legislation. I will bet, Madam Speaker, that every one of our colleagues has heard from constituents describing their own HMO horror story.

We have all seen headlines like, HMO's rules leave her dying for the doc she needs, or ex-New Yorker is told get castrated so we can save dollars. Or how about this headline: What his parents did not know about HMOs may have killed this baby.

Consider the 29-year-old cancer patient whose HMO would not pay for his treatments. The HMO case manager told him instead to hold a fund-raiser, a fund-raiser.

Well, Madam Speaker, we just had an hour of debate about campaign fund-raising. I certainly hope that campaign finance reform will not stymie that man's chance to get his cancer treatment.

During congressional hearings 2 years ago we heard testimony from Alan DeMeurers who lost his wife Christy to breast cancer. When a specialist at UCLA recommended she undergo bone marrow transplant surgery her HMO leaned on UCLA to change its medical opinion. Who knows whether Kristi would be with her two children today had her HMO not interfered with her doctor/patient relationship?

Other plans have placed ridiculous burdens on those seeking emergency care. Ask Jacqueline Lee how bad that can be. This 28-year-old lady was hiking in the mountains, just west of Washington, D.C. in the Shenandoah Mountains when she fell off a 40-foot cliff. She fractured her skull, her arm,

her pelvis. She was comatose, lying at the bottom of this 40-foot cliff. Fortunately, her hiking companion had a cellular phone and she was airlifted to a local hospital and she was treated in the ICU for a month on morphine drips.

Now, one will not believe this. Her HMO refused to pay for the services because she failed to get preauthorization. I ask, what was she supposed to do with her fractured skull, her broken arm, her broken pelvis, lying at the base of the cliff? Maybe wake up from her coma with her nonbroken arm, pull a cellular phone out of her pocket, dial a 1-800 phone number and say, hey, I just fell off a 40-foot cliff; I need to go to the hospital?

There are countless other examples. A pediatrician who worked in this area took care of a pediatric ICU. She told me about how a few years ago, a 6-year-old boy came into her ICU, after drowning. Prognosis was terrible. The little boy had been in the unit about 5 hours. They had him intubated. They had the drips running. Doctors and nurses and family were standing around the bed praying for a sign of life when the phone rings. It is a medical manager from the HMO.

Well, tell me about this little boy.

Well, he nearly drowned. The prognosis is not very good.

Now, one can almost picture the computer screen and the algorithm from this medical manager a thousand miles away. Ventilator patient, poor prognosis.

Well, came the next question, have you considered sending this little boy home on home ventilation? After all, it is cheaper.

Think about that. Does not that just about make the hair stand up on the back of your head? That is what we are dealing with.

□ 1645

Madam Speaker, because our friends and our neighbors and our fellow workers and our own families have had these types of experiences, countless polls show that people want Congress to pass managed care reform.

A recent Kaiser Family Foundation survey found that 78 percent of voters support managed care reform, and a similar percentage support allowing consumers to go to court to sue their health plans when those health plans are negligent. No public opinion poll, however, conveys the depth of emotion on this issue as well as movie audiences around the country who spontaneously clapped and cheered Helen Hunt when she gave an obscenity-laced evaluation and description of her HMO in the Oscar-winning movie, "As Good As It Gets." Audiences across the country responded to the plight of her little boy with asthma because they see the same thing happening to their friends, their neighbors, and their family members.

The industry responds by saying, Christy DeMeurers, Jacqueline Lee, this little boy who has just drowned,

they are just anecdotes; we do not legislate because of anecdotes. Well, Madam Speaker, to paraphrase Shakespeare, Hath not these anecdotes, these HMO victims, eyes? Hath not these anecdotes hands, organs, dimensions, senses, affections, passions? If you prick the anecdotes, do they not bleed? And if you cut short their care for profits, do those anecdotes not die?

Madam Speaker, I hope we never hear that word anecdote when we debate this issue on the floor this year.

Last year, I and a few other brave souls crossed party lines to push for passage of the Patients' Bill of Rights. It was a good bill, and it would have done a great deal to end the constant stream of HMO horror stories. It contained, for example, very strong language ensuring that health plans pay for emergency care.

Consider the plight of James Adams, aged 6 months old. At 3:30 in the morning, his mother, Lamona, found him hot, panting, and moaning. His temperature was 104 degrees. Lamona phoned her HMO and was told to take little Jimmy to the Scottish Rite Medical Center. Quote: "That is the only hospital I can send you to," the HMO reviewer added. "How do I get there," Lamona asked. "I don't know," the nurse said. "I am not good at directions."

Well, it turns out that Scottish Rite Hospital was about 70-some miles away. So, at 3:30 in the morning, Lamona and her husband wrap up little Jimmy, put him in the car. Picture this: It is a stormy night. They start their drive to the hospital. Madam Speaker, 20 miles into their ride they passed Emory University Hospital, a renowned pediatric center. Nearby were two more of Atlanta's leading hospitals, Georgia Baptist and Grady Memorial. But the Adams did not have permission to stop there, and so they pushed on. They had farther to go to get to Scottish Rite Hospital. While searching for the hospital, James' heart stopped.

There is a scene in the movie that is out now, *A Civil Action*, showing a mother and a father in a car on the side of the road on a stormy night administering CPR to their child. Think of Jimmy Adams when you see that movie.

Well, Lamona and her husband eventually got Jimmy to Scottish Rite. It looked like the boy would die. But he was a tough little guy, and despite his cardiac arrest, due to delay in treatment by his HMO, he survived. However, the doctors had to amputate both of his hands and both his feet because of the gangrene that resulted from his cardiac arrest.

All of this is documented in the book, *Health Against Wealth*, and as the details of Baby James' HMO's methods were emerged, it became clear that the margins of safety in that HMO were razor thin. Maybe as thin as the scalpel that had to amputate both this little boy's hands and both of his feet. For

the rest of his life, this little boy will never be able to play basketball. I talked to his mother last week. He has learned how to put on his leg prostheses without his bilateral hooks, but he cannot get on his bilateral hooks unless he has help from his mom. He will never be able to touch and caress the cheek of the woman that he loves some day.

Think of the dilemma an HMO places on a mother struggling to make ends meet. In Lamona's situation, if she rushes her child to the nearest emergency room, she could be at risk for hundreds or even thousands of dollars because she was not given authorization. It was not medically necessary to go to that nonprovider hospital. Or, she could hope that her child's condition will not worsen as they drive past one hospital after another, an additional 20 miles, to get to the nearest emergency room affiliated with their plan.

Madam Speaker, a strong HMO reform bill would ensure that consumers would not have to make that potentially disastrous choice.

Now, in recognition of problems in managed care, three managed care plans joined with Families USA and other consumer groups in 1997 to announce their support of an 18-point agenda. Here is a sample of the issues that the groups felt required nationally enforceable standards: Guaranteeing access to appropriate services, providing people with a choice of health plans, ensuring the confidentiality of medical records, protecting the continuity of care, providing consumers with relevant information, covering emergency care, and banning gag rules.

These health plans and consumer groups wrote, "Together, we are seeking to address problems that have led to a decline in consumer confidence and trust in health plans. We believe that thoughtfully designed health plan standards will help to restore confidence and ensure needed protection."

After listening to some of these examples of the victims of managed care, I would certainly agree with them, that we need some Federal standards to correct the abuses, and from the viewpoint of the plans, they certainly have a public relations disaster.

These plans said that they noted that they already make extensive efforts to improve the quality of care, and the Chief Executive Officer of the one plan said quote, "We intend to insist on even higher standards of behavior within our industry, and we are more than willing to see laws enacted to ensure that result."

Let me repeat that. The Chief Executive Officer of one of these nonprofit plans said, "We are more than willing to see laws enacted to ensure that result." However, I am sad to say that despite strong public support to correct problems like these and the support of some responsible managed care plans, legislation stalled in Washington last year. That is truly unfortunate, since the problem demands Federal action.

While historically, State insurance commissions have done an excellent job of monitoring the performance of health plans, Federal law puts most HMOs beyond the reach of State regulations. Now, how is this possible?

Well, more than two decades ago, Congress passed the Employee Retirement Income Security Act. As I have said before, this is called ERISA. It did this to provide some uniformity for pension plans in dealing with different State laws. Health plans were included in ERISA, almost as an afterthought. But the result has been a gaping regulatory loophole for self-insured plans under ERISA. Even more alarming is the fact that this lack of effective regulation is coupled with an immunity from liability for negligent actions.

Now, Madam Speaker, personal responsibility has been a watchword for this Republican Congress, and this issue should be no different. Health plans that recklessly deny needed medical service should be made to answer for their conduct. Laws that shield entities from their responsibility only encourage them to cut corners. Congress created this ERISA loophole, and Congress should fix it.

Now, many of the opponents to this legislation say, well, we will end up, if we pass this, with nationalized health insurance. It is always the big bogeyman, nationalized health insurance. But I ask my colleagues, think for a moment about buying a car. Federal laws ensure that cars have horns and brakes and headlights and seatbelts; they also ensure that they do not pollute. Yet, despite these minimum standards, we do not have a nationalized auto industry. Instead, consumers have lots of choices. But they know that whatever car they buy will meet certain minimum safety standards. One does not buy safety a la carte.

The same notion of basic protections and standards should apply to health plans. Consumer protections will not lead to socialized medicine any more than requiring seatbelts has led to a nationalized auto industry. In a free market, these minimum standards set a level playing field that allows competition to flourish.

Before closing, Madam Speaker, let me share some thoughts on how I think this issue will evolve in the coming months. As we know, we came close to passing the Patients' Bill of Rights last year in part, because I and some other Republicans crossed party lines to support the better bill. Already I see signs this year that the fight could break out the same way. We simply cannot let the issue of managed care reform die on the cross of partisanship.

So I decided not to cosponsor the Patients' Bill of Rights when it was introduced earlier this year. Instead, I introduced my own bill: The Managed Care Reform Act of 1999, H.R. 719. While my bill shares the best features of other leading managed care reform proposals, it also eliminates some provisions that would add regulatory burdens on health plans without providing

much in the way of added patient safety. In addition, the bill has a new formulation on the issue of health plan liability. I continue to believe that health plans which make negligent medical decisions should be accountable for their actions.

But a winning lawsuit is little consolation to a family who has lost a loved one. The best HMO bill ensures that health care is delivered when it is needed, and I also believe that the liability should attach to the entity that is making medical decisions.

Many self-insured companies contract with large managed care plans to deliver care. If the business is not making discretionary decisions, they should not face liability. This is true of folks like third-party administrators if they merely perform administrative functions. But if they cross the line and determine whether a particular treatment is medically necessary; remember, this brings us back to the medical necessity issue that I started this speech about. If they cross that line in a given case, then they are making medical decisions, and they should be responsible for their actions.

To encourage health plans to give patients the right care without having to go to court, my bill provides for both an internal and an external appeals process. But unlike last year's Republican bill, the external review is binding on the plan.

□ 1700

It could be requested by either the patient or the health plan. The review would be done by an independent panel of medical experts. Frequently, patients pursuing cases through appeal win. They win their treatment. But many times, also, the plan's decision is proven to be the right one.

My bill provides that, if the plan follows the definition of the external review panel, there could not be punitive damages liability on either the health plan or the business. After all, there cannot be any malice if they have bound themselves to the decision of an independent panel of experts.

Madam Speaker, I suspect Aetna wishes they had had an independent peer panel available, even with the binding decision on care, when it denied care to David Goodrich. Earlier this year, a California jury handed down a verdict with \$116 million in punitive damages to Teresa Goodrich, his widow. If Aetna or the Goodriches had had the ability to send the denial of care to an external review, with a binding decision on the plan, where that independent panel has the authority to determine clinical standards of care as medical necessity, then they could have avoided the courtroom. But more importantly, David Goodrich might be alive today.

That is why my plan should be attractive to both sides. Consumers get a reliable and quick external appeals process that will help them get the care that they need. They can go to

court to collect economic damages like lost wages and future medical care and noneconomic damages like pain and suffering.

If the plan fails to follow the external reviews decision, the patient can sue for punitive damages. But if it has gone in a timely fashion through the review process to that independent panel for a binding decision on the plan, that plan then knows that it has no punitive damages liability. That is the big unknown to an insurance company. That eliminates for them the risk of a \$50 million or \$100 million punitive damages award. But they have to follow the recommendations of that independent review panel.

I have heard from insurers that they fear that this legislation will cause premiums to increase. I think there is ample evidence that this would not be the case. Last year, the Congressional Budget Office estimated that a similar proposal, which did not include punitive damages relief, would only increase premiums around 2 percent over 10 years.

When Texas passed its own liability law 2 years ago, Scott and White Health Plan estimated that premiums would have to increase just 34 cents per member per month to cover the cost. These are hardly alarming figures.

The low estimate by Scott and White seems accurate since only one suit has been filed against a Texas health plan since Texas passed legislation similar to this. That is far from the flood of litigation that opponents predicted.

Madam Speaker, I have been encouraged by the positive response my bill has received. I think this could be the basis for a bipartisan bill this year. In fact, I spoke with the CEO of a large Blue Cross plan who confided to me that his organization is already implementing virtually all of the recommendations of the President's Health Care Quality Advisory Commission for little or no cost.

One part of the health care debate that concerns him is the issue of liability. He has indicated that shielding plans from punitive damages when they follow an external review body would strike an appropriate balance.

Madam Speaker, passage of real patient protection legislation is going to require a lot of hard work, dedication, and some compromise. My new bill represents an effort to break through this partisan gridlock and move this issue forward.

I hope to work with all my colleagues to help break the logjam keeping patient protection legislation from becoming law. This issue is vitally important to families across this country.

To my fellow legislators, please do not let the insurers define "medically necessary" or someday my colleagues or a family member or a friend will find themselves defined out of a treatment that is a clinical standard of care that could save their life or the life of somebody else.

RACISM, DEADLY DIFFERENCES AND DIVERSITY PROBLEMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I would like to address a number of issues that I think are very much related to the problem of racism, of deadly differences, and diversity problems that have broken out all over the world and we are part of trying to resolve.

A lot of them occur right here at home. In my own city of New York, a poll was taken that showed, and the New York Times announced today, that one-fourth of all New Yorkers, white and black New Yorkers, believe that the police of New York City behave quite differently with people of color, with minority groups, African Americans, Hispanics, and Asians, they behave quite differently with them than they do with whites. Whites as well as blacks have come to this conclusion. One-fourth of all the citizens of New York believe that this is the case.

So we have a serious problem right at home with a very crucial body of people, the police, who are so vital to the law and order of the city for everybody, everybody's protection.

Then we have far-ranging problems like those that are taking place in Kosovo and Yugoslavia where this government is spending large amounts of money, we have spent about \$9 billion, to try to work through situations in Yugoslavia which evolve out of racial and ethnic and religious differences. Whereas I was all in favor, of course, of extending the resources of this country into that situation, I think that the Yugoslavia situation is totally out of hand. And \$9 billion, more than \$9 billion is enough to invest.

Our Nation is an indispensable Nation available, and I think that is important to help with trouble spots anywhere in the world. But we should not let ourselves get sucked into any trouble spot for so long that it absorbs an inordinate amount of resources and takes away the possibility of helping with other problems.

I think it was right that we went into Haiti to help liberate Haiti from people who had taken over from a duly elected democratic government. I think it was important that we went into Somalia. I think it is important that the President has shown great concern, and there are some resources now deployed in Rwanda. All of these situations, Rwanda, Somalia, Kosovo, Serbia, Bosnia, Northern Ireland. Our President did not dispense large amounts of military aid in Northern Ireland, but his own personal commitment there and the use of American diplomatic skills have helped to abate that situation.

But all over the country, all over the world, we have these conflicts based on differences and diversity. They are probably going to go on for a long, long

time. We have to learn how to live with them and to try to abate them and try to lessen them. Hopefully over the long period, decades and centuries, we can eliminate some of them.

First we have to understand how difficult it is and how deeply entrenched it is and how it is important that governmental resources be invested in the effort to lessen the amount of racism, hate crimes, ethnic rivalries that exist and might explode at any moment. It is important.

It is important that we understand the need to deal, first of all, with those that are closest to us. One of the closest conflicts and ongoing problems in America is racism related to the long history of African Americans who were held in slavery for 232 years.

We do not like to think that 232 years of slavery had any consequences or that there is anything special about this particular group and their relationship with the rest of the Americans, just as we do not like to think there is any special relationship between the Native Americans and the rest of the American people, that there should be any special consideration.

But surely there ought to be some special consideration about the relationship between the descendants of the Native Americans and the rest of the Americans in view of the fact that history was quite brutal with respect to the Native Americans.

History was quite brutal with respect to African Americans who are a group of people in this country, in this hemisphere, only because they were transported to this hemisphere against their will.

So I want to talk about all of these things. In the news today, there was also an account of a new effort to try to fight slavery in the Sudan and slavery in Mauritania. We have some groups that are American based that are actually raising money to buy slaves from the Sudanese.

The Sudanese are practicing slavery in a very cruel and inhuman way even to this day. They say it is all part of the Civil War. Only the women and children of the enemy are captured, and they have a right to take them and use them for bounty and whatever. Whatever the reason given, it is still slavery.

In 1999, in Sudan, which is a country of people who are of dark hue, one might say black, a lot of black people, whatever range of color they may have, there is slavery.

There is slavery in Mauritania. Arabs and people of an Arab descent and African descent, all in Mauritania. But in Mauritania, there are some black people who are still enslaved in 1999.

I thought that was interesting that that appeared on the news today. At the same time I heard on the news this morning, and I listen usually to National Public Radio, and there was some bad news about Northern Ireland. A civil rights lawyer in Northern Ireland, Catholic civil rights activist law-

yer was assassinated with a fire bomb. A fire bomb blew up her car.

So we have reminders of many kinds of how these ethnic tensions, religion. In the case of Ireland, it is religion that has divided people. It is very interesting how human beings seem to look for reasons for conflict. They want to accentuate differences. So we have people who are ethnically pretty much the same, racially the same in Northern Ireland, but the religious differences have set off a long time feud which is quite violent and bloody.

In Somalia, we could not understand what the problem was in Somalia. They were all most of the same religion, same race. There were no deep tribal divisions. They all spoke the same language.

Yet, in Somalia, the human beings there found ways to accentuate some differences. That was generally based on pure politics, people having power ambitions in one area and organizing their own gang; and over here, they would organize another gang. There were no tribes, but they created tribes out of interests that were really power interests.

Of course here is the crux of the problem. Most of the time, these ethnic tensions, racial tensions and divisions are accelerated and exacerbated by people who do want power, demagogues who exploit the situation for power reasons.

We have 232 years of slavery in this Nation because, for economic reasons, which also are power reasons, for economic reasons, it was beneficial to enslave a population and provide the free labor from one end of the country to the other. It was mostly in the south, the plantations. There was a long-term need for free labor and large amounts of labor there.

But in New York, large amounts of slaves were used to build the original city. Slavery was just as cruel there as it was anywhere else. The third largest slave port of the country at one time was a New York slave port. So all of these things still have their long-term fallout on history. It would do well for us to pay more attention to history.

I applaud President Clinton and his appointment of a commission on race relations to at least stimulate a set of discussions and dialogues among the American people about the issue of race and differences in relationships.

Some people say it got out of hand and it was not very productive. It only had a year's life. For whatever the problems were, it was still a positive, constructive action. I hope the President will follow it up with further action. But more importantly, here is an area where I think foundations and philanthropists could make a contribution.

□ 1715

There are a lot of controversies that are inevitably associated with anything related to race relations. The controversies could probably better be

handled by the philanthropic sector. And the kind of controversies they are, they are not so much current but scholarly discussions and discussions of positions and attitudes, and I think they ought to be handled more with foundations and other philanthropic organizations financing those areas than the government. But the government should stimulate that discussion. President Clinton started the discussion, and I think we ought to, as a government, follow up on that.

I think that the resolution of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TONY HALL), that called for the government of America to apologize for slavery, which aroused so much controversy and ill feeling across the country, I think that is still a pertinent item of discussion. I think it is a lightning rod that we should really discuss.

Why should the American government not apologize for slavery when we are seeing the governments of Japan and of Germany and various other governments that exist now that were not really there, the German government was not there when Hitler was there, but the present government has apologized in certain areas; as well as the government of Japan has apologized to the Korean women who were forced into prostitution and to some others; and other apologies are taking place.

The Swiss government just apologized and set up a fund to the victims of greed the holocaust victims of greed, where they put the money in Swiss banks and the Swiss banks used various maneuvers to keep those people from getting money.

So it is a discussion which carries civilization forward, and a discussion of an American apology for slavery would do a great deal in that direction.

I think the South Africans set an example for civilized nations of today and the future that should not be ignored. The Government of South Africa today, the new Government of South Africa today, that took over just 4 years ago, insisted that it would not seek justice, it would seek reconciliation. That was a very important and unprecedented move by a national government.

Here is a government made up of a new majority. The majority of the people, about 40 million black Africans in South Africa, had been oppressed for many decades by the white South Africans. The black majority took over in South Africa. The government was made up of a government elected by the people and most of the people in power were black. Instead of seeking justice, which would have resulted in large numbers of trials, executions, and a whole lot of revenge-seeking, the South African government that took power proclaimed that it wanted reconciliation. And no matter how horrible the crime was, no matter how horrible the political crime was related to the politics of the long years of oppression and the fight against apartheid, they would allow people to come

forward and, if they would tell the truth, they would offer amnesty to those folks who told the truth.

More important than the individuals who came forward and the testimonies that took place and the whole unprecedented kind of activity that they developed, is the spirit that that sent out throughout the whole country; that we are not going to look at the past, we are not going to live in the past to the point where it becomes a noose around the throat of the future and the present. We are not going to seek justice to the point where it destroys the possibility for reconciliation and progress.

So reconciliation. And this was a new idea to me, I never thought of it that way before Nelson Mandela and the Government of South Africa today put it forward. Reconciliation is more important than justice. Reconciliation is more important than justice.

We hammered home this same theme when Jean Bertrand Aristide was restored to his rightful place in Haiti. The government of the United States insisted that he also follow the same policy. We made an official request that the Aristide government not seek justice but, instead, emphasize reconciliation.

That whole approach, of course, is being carried out in Bosnia and Serbia and Croatia. We are paying billions for that, too much in my opinion, but we are leading the way to a process of reconciliation, which will provide for building for a future rather than justice.

I do not say justice is not important, and I do not think human society can exist unless we have forms of punishment. People must be punished, and there must be an understanding that individuals will be held accountable for crimes. I do not think anybody would ever say that Hitler should have been treated the way some of the leaders of Haiti were treated.

The United States Government actually paid the rent, leased the homes of the dictators in Haiti that they deposed. Cedras and the other two who were at the top of the official terror apparatus in Haiti were treated like princes and helped to get out of the place and given enough income to maintain themselves for a long time. They are still out there alive, and may come back. That is a danger. Instead of justice, it was important that they be moved from the scene peacefully in order to facilitate reconciliation.

Now, I do not think the Nuremberg trials were wrong. I do not think the trials of the Japanese perpetrators of massive violence in Asia, the people who attacked Pearl Harbor, I do not think it was wrong to punish them. That is going quite far. But it is something to consider, this whole reconciliation process. And in the case of the nations now that participate in reconciliation, we are seeing a more positive result as a result of reconciliation being placed above justice.

But the South Africans in the process of seeking reconciliation felt it was very important to have truth. Truth was a very important part of establishing reconciliation. I think in America we have missed that point with respect to race relations, and certainly relationships between the Native Americans and the rest of the American population, and certainly with relationship between the African Americans and the rest of the American population.

We have never admitted, as a government, that great crimes were done to the African Americans who were enslaved, and that the consequences of 232 years of slavery need to be studied. The truth needs to be laid out, and we need to take steps to combat some of those consequences.

A very interesting individual specific development is taking place which I think we ought to focus on as part of the way to get more truth thrown on the whole phenomenon of American slavery. There is a controversy which is made for America because it is very individual, it is very personal, and it involves a love story. It is the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings.

Sally Hemings was a slave at Monticello under Thomas Jefferson. For many, many years there has been a controversy about whether or not there was a relationship between Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson which produced some children, four or five children. The controversy is not about whether Thomas Jefferson might have had sex with Sally Hemings. Many slave owners had sex with their slaves, and there are millions of mulattos that resulted from those unions to provide concrete evidence that many slave owners had sexual relationships with their slaves. The problem with Jefferson is that it appears that he had a long-term relationship with Sally Hemings, that he treated her as if she was his common law wife.

For 38 years, Sally Hemings was on the scene, starting from the time that she went to Paris as a nurse and maid for Jefferson's youngest daughter, to the time that Jefferson died. She was there all the time. She was there in Paris. She could have gone free; stayed in Paris and been a free person. She did not. She came back to Monticello. She was in Monticello during the whole time that Jefferson was President. And when he left the Presidency, she remained at Monticello, and she was there when he died.

There was a big public scandal related to the relationship between Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson. A man named Callendar, who had been a so-called friend of Jefferson, Jefferson had gotten him out of prison when John Adams, with his alien and sedition laws put large numbers of people in prison who were accused of treason on the basis of what they wrote and the criticisms they made of the government, Callendar was imprisoned. And, of course, Jefferson was against the alien

and sedition laws and against the federalist dictatorship that was being generated.

Once Jefferson was elected as President, Callendar was set free. Callendar had written articles and done some things with Jefferson's party and Jefferson, and Callendar wanted to become a postmaster. When Jefferson would not make him a postmaster, Callendar turned on Jefferson and went to Monticello and got all the gossip together, and he was the one who accused Jefferson of having a mistress with children at Monticello.

It became a big public scandal. It was in newspapers from one part of the country to the other. Jefferson was ridiculed. John Quincy Adams wrote a ballad making fun of him, et cetera, et cetera. Jefferson never admitted anything, of course. He never even commented. But the relationship was not ended. Sally Hemings was not sent away from Monticello. She remained there. She remained there during his Presidency, and then after he went back, she remained there, and until his death, as I have just said several times. So Sally Hemings and Thomas Jefferson, the questions remained.

A historian recently, not so recently, about 15 years ago, documented the fact that Jefferson was at Monticello every time that Sally Hemings conceived children. The period before the birth of her children, he was at Monticello at all those times. They had other various things that they documented in his notations in his farm books, et cetera, which indicated that Sally Hemings was very much a presence at Monticello.

There are certain letters, of course, and other kinds of things that are missing from Jefferson's numerous writings that were also timed at a time when he had some kind of important relationship that might have had a record of some kind of relationship with Sally Hemings. Many of those letters are missing. No documentation.

Sally Hemings is erased from history. We do not have any photographs of her or any descriptions of her, except the one or two from her son and from a man who had been a slave at Monticello, Isaac Jefferson.

So I will talk about the controversy that has now mounted to the point where so much documentation existed which confirmed the fact that there was a relationship between Jefferson and Hemings that a DNA test was developed. A scientist who happened to be residing at Monticello carefully put together a DNA test. He secretly got permission from Jefferson offspring, known offspring of the Jefferson family, and he got permission and DNA from the offspring of Sally Hemings. And after putting it through a very rigorous set of tests, the confirmation is that it is very probable. The DNA tests bear out the other kinds of documentation that Jefferson was the father of Sally Hemings' youngest child and, therefore, it makes all of the other evidence more credible.

I am going to quote from an article that I wrote on this whole matter, and I think I will save some time and make the point that I am trying to make tonight better if I read from this article. It is entitled "Kingspins for Truth and Reconciliation, Thomas and Sally".

"DNA evidence confirming Jefferson's relationship with Sally Hemings could open the door for a more profound dialogue on slavery and race relations."

If that strikes my colleagues as strange, let me read it again. "DNA evidence confirming Jefferson's relationship with Sally Hemings could open the door for a more profound dialogue on slavery and race relations".

This portion of slavery that has never been discussed fully is related to the fact that there were intimate relations between the races. From a power point of view, it usually was the slave owners and the overseers and the people who had privileges and power who interacted with the female slaves. But out of that is a set of truths that come concerning myths about inferiority, myths about abilities to coexist, a number of things which not only are documented and reinforced by the new evidence of Jefferson's relationship with Sally Hemings, but there have been several books written lately which I think also fall into this same pattern.

I am going to read first from my article to make things shorter.

□ 1730

I will read some excerpts from it. "Only a few months after the release of the report of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race, and that report is entitled 'One America In The 21st Century: Forging a New Future,' a scientific report has confirmed the likelihood that President Thomas Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave and long-time companion, Sally Hemings. These two events can be constructively related."

Let me repeat. "Only a few months after the release of the report of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race, and the report is entitled 'One America In The 21st Century, Forging a New Future,' a scientific report has confirmed the likelihood that President Thomas Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave and long-time companion Sally Hemings. These two events can be constructively related."

And again, I want to point out that two new books have come out which talk about slave owners and their children by slaves. And I read only the review of this. I have not had a chance to read the book. The review appeared in the Washington Post. It is called "The Hairstons, an American Family in Black and White," published by St. Martin's Press. And it talks about a family where slaves and slave owners and the personnel of the plantations were intermixed, and it singles out one tragic story of one slave owner who de-

cided that he loved his slave wife, common-law wife. Some would call it a mistress or concubine. I do not think he thought of it that way. He loved her so much that he willed her daughter a large part of his property. And there was a big fight to take that property away, which succeeded of course, and she was left in slavery. But a very concrete tragedy there.

Another book that recently came out is called "Slaves in the Family." The author of that one is Edward Ball. "Slaves in the Family" by Edward Ball goes back and deals with a South Carolina based huge plantation and a large family over several generations and he shows how the intermarriage and the mixtures came down to the present.

I think it is important, another book that also talks about this in more general terms and had the advantage of being part of a public television series is "Africans in America." "Africans in America" brings out some very interesting facts that are little known about slavery and the freed men and the whole relationship with the general population, etcetera.

So returning to my article, "The new discussions of the life, philosophy, and politics of Thomas Jefferson might do more to facilitate an honest assessment of black-white relations in America than the report which is laden with facts."

The report is the "One America in the 21st Century" that was put out by the Initiative On Race. I thought it was an interesting report. But, as my colleagues can see from my remarks here, I do not think it went nearly far enough. But if we took the report together with the new facts, together these two developments could greatly enhance our understanding of an extremely complex phenomena.

"The weakness of the report of the President's Advisory Board is that it is thorough about obvious kinds of things that we all know about but it lacks the vital ingredient of profundity. The report is competent, respectful, universal in its coverage, balanced, and not at all an embarrassment to the White House. However, when the depth of the deliberations of that report are measured against the complexity of the mission and the intensity of the challenge, the appropriate grade for this noble but feeble effort would be B- or C+. Our national dialogue would be greatly benefited by the establishment of several adequately financed commissions on group relations.

"Native Americans certainly deserve their own separate historical documentation and analysis. African-Americans require no less than an objective statement of history, a thorough and comprehensive study as a basis for the unraveling of the many complexities of our present interaction with mainstream society.

"Contrary to the beliefs of many African-Americans, as well as others, current policy-making would be greatly enhanced by a world-class study of

American slavery and the thwarted reconstruction effort that followed the Emancipation Proclamation and the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments. Such a study would be useful if it is done in the spirit of truth and reconciliation.

"The noble embryo that the President's Initiative has planted should be allowed to sprout and grow. Using the bully pulpit of the White House, the President should call on private foundations to finance such a world-class project and he should recommend that the world's top scholars and thinkers, including Nobel Prize winners, be recruited to provide research and editorial guidance for such a study.

"One of the first items that should be placed on the research and analysis agenda is a controversial question of the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. It would be a human interest case study offering great illuminations for American history. It could also be an educational landmark love story that captures the attention of a mass audience and forces them to confront the institution of slavery in all of its dimensions.

"The scientific validation of Jefferson's paternity with respect to Hemings' children is a historical blockbuster. DNA evidence has exposed the fact that respected academicians and historians have promulgated or tolerated a dangerous and suffocating denial of certain self-evident truths about American slavery. This same distortion process applies to too much of American history as it relates to slavery, the Civil War and reconstruction.

"Unlike the very civilized behavior of the new rulers of South Africa, the United States has never had a truth and reconciliation commission. As part of a larger effort, the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings could provide a potent spark to generate a bonfire of new revelations which will increase the possibility of long-term, improved black-white reconciliation."

Most people would say that they do not see how any probing of such a relationship could lead to anything but more controversy, more hostility, and more antagonism between the races, starting with the numerous African-Americans who want to throw Thomas Jefferson down from his throne because now it has been confirmed that he took advantage of a slave woman. Well, I do not think the evidence confirms anything of the nature.

Slave owners were in a position to take advantage of all their slaves. That is true. But the evidence with respect to Thomas Jefferson is that this particular woman he cared a great deal for. He maintained her near him in Monticello, in the mansion, for 38 years despite a scandal that normally would lead a politician to distance himself from such a person.

"The story of Thomas and Sally may be summarized as follows: While Jefferson was serving as the American ambassador in Paris, Sally Hemings arrived as a maid for his younger daughter who sailed from Virginia to join her

father. Jefferson seduced her, and the pregnant Sally returned to America only after he promised that all of her children would be set free. Under French law, she could have remained a free person in France.

"During the first year of his presidency, a journalist exposed the fact that Jefferson had a 'slave mistress' who was the mother of his children. The third president of the United States refused to answer this charge. He also never removed Sally Hemings from Monticello. They were together for 38 years at Monticello until Jefferson died.

"Three of their children were allowed to 'run.'" Jefferson noted in his farm books and his accounts that whenever one of the Hemings children left the plantation they really were set free with his consent, he would just note in his book that they were allowed to run. Because to set them free required certain kinds of filing of papers; and in Virginia, once you were set free, you had a limited amount of time to get out of the State. There were complications. So they were just allowed to run and the notations were made.

Nevertheless, these same children who were allowed to run always ended up in urban settings where they got new footing and it was assumed that Jefferson, and his friends had helped to establish his children in those new settings to enable them to thrive. Two of the children were set free in Jefferson's will.

"With the DNA testing confirming Jefferson paternity, the journey so competently and eloquently begun by Fawn Brodie with her best selling book entitled "Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History" has now reached its peak."

That is more than 15 years ago that Fawn Brodie, who was a professor at one of California universities, wrote a book called "Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History." The book was denounced by the Regional Daughters of Virginia, and a number of other historical groups denounced Fawn Brodie. But her set of facts, her documentation, was used to set in motion a process that has continued to today. And finally we have the DNA testing.

"Despite vicious criticisms from the establishment historians still prolonging the Confederate view of American history, Brodie's scholarship propelled the search for truth forward. While the relationship between Jefferson and Hemings was not her primary preoccupation, Brodie provided this story with a rightful proportion of the space," and she integrated the story of Sally Hemings with the rest of her narrative.

"Brodie's thorough account of Jefferson as a failing businessman on the brink of bankruptcy alongside the documentation of the continuous presentation of Sally Hemings may both raise and answer an obvious question: Why didn't Jefferson marry a wealthy widow or a daughter of a wealthy per-

son to end his financial woes?" I repeat. "Brodie's thorough account of Jefferson as a failing businessman on the brink of bankruptcy alongside the documentation of the continuous presence of Sally Hemings may both raise and answer an obvious question: Why didn't Jefferson marry a wealthy widow or the daughter of a wealthy person to end his financial woes?"

"With an eye more focused, and operating from a courtroom point of view, a more recent book by Annette Gordon-Bennett updates the work of Brodie, and with her remarkable presentation of the evidence, has stimulated the more recent debates which has helped produce the DNA testing. Now all sides must respond to the scientific evidence. In her book, 'Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy,' Gordon-Bennett goes on to indict the establishment historians for their gross neglect of vital records.

"Barbara Chase-Riboud in the novel entitled 'Sally Hemings,'" which was written based on facts related in Fawn Brodie's nonfiction work, the novel by Barbara Chase-Riboud "offers a uniquely constructed and very ambitious fictional account to interpret the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. Her point of view repeatedly emerges crystal clear throughout the novel. Although her writing is often laborious and strained, she sometimes reaches dramatic heights in her depictions of emotions of her imagined victims of Jefferson's patriarchal and slave-owning powers. Chase-Riboud is able fictionally to occupy the bodies and souls of Sally and her children, and from within them she confronts what she imagines to be the cold blue insensitive eyes of the master of Monticello."

Chase-Riboud depicts Jefferson as a patronizing anti-woman, cruel oppressor.

"From this novelist, Jefferson is a white, southern aristocrat trapped within the personality parameters of his class and his time." That is her point of view. "He is also a male chauvinist pig who raped and ruined a young slave girl who is left with no alternative except to 'love him to death.'"

"Chase-Riboud forces Sally to become a drug to afflict the addict Jefferson til death parts them. The merits of Jefferson's public achievements and historic accomplishments can never offset his intimate behavior flaws in the opinion of Barbara Chase-Riboud," who is a female story teller of African descent.

□ 1745

Each day since the new DNA discovery, I read or hear the same kind of intense condemnations of Jefferson, although they are usually more blunt and crude and they lack the redeeming eloquence of Barbara Chase-Riboud.

I hear them from African-American females who want to dismiss Jefferson and forget about the fact that Jeffer-

son was a precursor to Lincoln and the whole idealistic bold advance of Jefferson made it possible to create an America which would later emancipate its slaves.

I am compelled personally to register intense disagreement with Chase-Riboud and all those others who want to knock Jefferson off his pedestal for that reason. There are people on the other side, the conservatives and the Confederates, who want to dismiss Jefferson now because, if he did have a serious relationship with a slave, then he does not deserve to remain in their pantheon. But let me deal with those who are African American who refuse to accept Jefferson for what he really is and what he did contribute both to America and to the emancipation of the slaves.

Any interpretation of the Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings relationship that discounts or trivializes Jefferson as an idealist, a visionary, an intellectual, a pragmatic statesman and a crafty Machiavellian politician is not acceptable in my view. He was an idealist and his ideals are still very important to what happened, the sequence of events that took place in America, even those that led to the Emancipation Proclamation. The fact that such a giant as Thomas Jefferson chose to keep Sally Hemings at his side for 38 years opens the door to a myriad of magnificent questions: Does the length of the relationship despite the inconvenience caused by public exposure and scandal clearly show that it was not a lust but a love relationship? If he did not "love" Sally Hemings, then why did he not just keep her as a concubine while he married a woman of wealth to solve his ever present financial problems? Would a confirmation of his deep love for Sally Hemings not also clarify a number of the other riddles and contradictions which are related to this so-called "sphinx"? The last great book on Jefferson was called "The Sphinx."

The same youthful Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with an original draft that condemned slavery, also set forth a racist platform in the book called "Notes on the State of Virginia." I repeat. The same youthful Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with an original draft that condemned slavery, also set forth a racist platform in "Notes on the State of Virginia." As a young Congressman, however, Jefferson led the fight to stop the spread of slavery into the new States. He led the fight to stop the spread of slavery, and he lost that by one vote, by the way. He lost that bill by one vote. He stated that slaves had a limited capacity for learning. Nevertheless, Jefferson urged at one time that slaves should be educated and then set free. In the oppressive social and political environment of Virginia, why did Jefferson speak out of both sides of his mouth? Why were there contradictions? Why did Jefferson not just settle down comfortably as a pure acknowledged slave owner and

racist? In his philosophical restlessness and his discontent with his own public positions, one can find the wellsprings of Jefferson's greatness. The politician in his pronouncements surrendered to his peers while privately he subscribed to greater truths. His love for Sally was probably a constant internal irritant. This lifelong reverence for his chambermaid is also a vital and legitimate clue to what he personally believed with respect to the equality of the races.

I said that Jefferson was an idealist, he was a visionary, he was an intellectual, but he was also a pragmatic statesman and a crafty Machiavellian politician. Jefferson founded the first political party in America. Jefferson united with a guy called Aaron Burr who most people did not trust to form the first political party in America. Aaron Burr, true to his reputation, later betrayed Jefferson, but that was necessary to get an opposition party going to the Federalists. Jefferson pretended he was not interested in being elected President, while he was plotting all the time to become President and successfully managed to become President. Jefferson was a politician, and I do not find the fact that he made contradictory statements to be a great puzzle. He is not a sphinx to me. Politicians do make contradictory statements all the time. Unfortunately that happens and we say it is in order to achieve some more noble goal that we distort the truth or we do not tell what we really think. But Jefferson was not only a politician, he was a southern politician. He was rooted in the plantation culture of Virginia. Consider all that and consider the fact that he still led the fight on the floor of the House of Representatives to stop the spread of slavery into the other States.

In the Virginia environment where slavery escalated downward into an ever more savage and criminal institution, did Jefferson's attachment to Sally and her children keep the embers of his antislavery sentiments burning? If there was some way that we could miraculously recover the missing letters of Jefferson, would we find corrections of his most racist utterings? Would we find apologies to Sally Hemings? Would we find expressions of his great love for Sally in his own insightful words?

Jefferson, while he was President, also later narrowly fought for and narrowly passed the legislation which ended the importation of slaves into the country. That was very difficult. It took his son-in-law, Randolph. His son-in-law Randolph had to help him a great deal to pass that legislation. It is probable that the recent DNA clarification will generate more than new scholarly debates among academicians. More fictional interpretations in poetry and novels and drama are inevitable in the quest to fill in the gaps of a tale that is about both love and power. I think that the accounts of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings,

the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings, the history of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings is now at the point where it is a bit of a legend and it will take on all the trappings of a legend, and Barbara Chase-Riboud's novel will not be the last novel. There will be many novels, there will be many plays, there will be other kinds of things done in connection with this love story which also tells a whole lot about power in America and about the idealism and the kind of people who helped to make this Nation great, the kind of person who helped to twist events in a way which led the way, established the prerequisite for what later happened with Lincoln and the Emancipation Proclamation.

As much as he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, the third President of the United States and the purchaser of the Louisiana Territory, Thomas Jefferson was also the concerned father of several children of African descent. With unfortunate limitations and restraints, the evidence is that Jefferson loved his common-law wife and his children. He was not a brilliant, cold-blooded beast. The hypocrisy he felt compelled to perpetrate certainly created a personal life wracked with intense conflicts.

Jefferson's public statements on race and slavery often stand in opposition to his private passion and compassion. However, when his intimate relationship with Sally is affixed to selected public actions, it is clear that he consciously made a vital contribution to the abolition of slavery. There are many who contend that without Jefferson, there could never have been an emancipating Abraham Lincoln. Congressman Jefferson attempted to halt the expansion of slavery into new States and failed by one vote in the House of Representatives. As President he narrowly won a victory for a law that finally ended the legal importation of slaves. It is also important to note that Jefferson's advocacy for the rights of the common white man had to take roots before Lincoln could fight the war that freed the slaves. Let me repeat. It is also important to note that Jefferson's advocacy for the rights of the common white man had to take roots before Lincoln could fight the war that freed the slaves.

Jefferson was quoted by the slave mongers as well as by the abolitionists as they made their cases during his time, or shortly after his death and up to the Civil War, into the Civil War. Both sides claimed Jefferson. Until today he is still cited by racists as well as progressives. The new DNA clarification of his paternity of Sally Hemings' children may finally end this ideological tug of war. In a superficial response, the races may jettison the man who treated the slave mother of his children as if she were his common-law wife.

A more profound response from progressives in general and African Americans specifically would be a new cele-

bration of Jefferson as the prerequisite to Lincoln. It is an historical fact that one of Jefferson's proteges, Edward Coles, took his slaves from Virginia to Illinois where he gave them their freedom and acres of land. Edward Coles later became governor of Illinois, he defeated a referendum seeking to make Illinois a slave State, and he was an active politician in Illinois at the time of Lincoln's election and at the time of the Civil War. More than mere words and ideas connected Thomas Jefferson to Abraham Lincoln.

Celebrations of the new Jefferson discoveries and expressions of gratitude to the science of genetics which produced DNA testing I think are very much in order. What the historians and the researchers of several generations refused to examine objectively has now been determined to be almost certainly true. The white male southern academicians who have dominated the interpretation of pre and post Civil War history have now been thoroughly discredited. Their refusal to accept overwhelming evidence with respect to Jefferson, of necessity, raises serious questions about the integrity of the rest of their scholarship.

Some obvious indictments of these proponents of the Confederate view of history are now in order. The establishment historians are guilty of ignoring the record of widespread miscegenation fostered by white men and its implications. Mainstream scholars have refused to offer any meaningful expositions of the "breeding farm" industry, for example. On the other hand, post-Civil War terrorism and violence by the defeated rebels has been glorified. "The Birth of a Nation" movie was an interpretation that has never been answered by academicians with a true and thorough story of the terrorism, the murder and the mayhem which returned the blacks of the South to a state of semi-slavery. I am talking about what a Truth and Reconciliation Commission could have accomplished. Instead of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission, we had John Wilkes Booth. We had Booth assassinating Lincoln. We had Andrew Johnson, who took over at that point, the last thing he wanted was truth, and as a result we had a downward slide back into the era when terror, murder and mayhem for the blacks in the South returned, and it took us another 100, or more than 100 years to get back to restoring the civil rights of the African-American population, certainly of the South.

If we had some truth, if we had some honest historians to shed some light along the way on some of these things, we might have made different kinds of public policy decisions and, of course, the reason I am here today is because there is a definite connection. Our present race problems, our present serious race problems as far as African Americans are concerned are rooted in 232 years of slavery. There are still people who make speeches about African Americans being inferior, African

Americans are prone to criminal activities, African Americans are generally not as well off as other people. Even immigrants who came to this country much later than the African Americans have accumulated more wealth. There are answers to all of these assertions, to all of these misstatements of fact. There are answers, but unless you have a concerted, systematic pursuit of truth, you are never going to be able to establish the answers which will allow us to have meaningful public policymaking.

In summary, the recent kingpin discovery which confirms the common-law marriage relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings has generated new demands for more historical truth to support current reconciliation between whites and African Americans. I am saying that the recent kingpin discovery which confirms the common-law marriage relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings has generated new demands for more historical truth to support current reconciliation between whites and African Americans.

□ 1800

Madam Speaker, I believe that the truth can support reconciliation. I do not think the truth has to be a generator of more hostility and ill will.

Since there was no Truth In Reconciliation Commission established following the Civil War, it would be wise to currently create a substitute project. That has come as close as we can to a Truth In Reconciliation Commission. We did not have the advantage of the South African Nation has when it tried to get rid of a large part of the baggage and the garbage related to racial oppression, the victimization, the response to the victimization, the people seeking revenge. All kinds of poison existed that the South African government is trying to get rid of by establishing a Truth In Reconciliation Commission. We had no such commission following the Civil War.

Instead of a comprehensive approach similar to the Truth In Reconciliation Commission and instead of a comprehensive approach, which was attempted by the President's Commission on Race, it is recommended that smaller components of the overall problem of U.S. race relations be explored separately. I recommend that we have this kind of Nobel Prize guided winner, guided truth-seeking group who would write an objective history for us of slavery. I would recommend that it be explored in segments. An objective rewrite of the history of slavery in America constitutes a productive beginning. They may want to go back and write the history of slavery for all times. They may want to write the history of the exploitation and the destruction of the Indian Nations, the Native Americans, on this continent. They may want to get segments in order to help tell the whole story. But certainly the history of slavery in

America would constitute a productive beginning, an objective history of what it was all about. You know, what does it mean to keep people for 232 years in bondage, what was the cruelty, and the abuse of children and the attempt to obliterate the humanity of human beings? What were the consequences of that?

And as I said earlier, a consortium of foundations could finance such a sweeping study, and Nobel Prize winning scholars throughout the world could be recruited to supervise such a study and to guarantee the objectivity of such a study. In that demonstration of extraordinary and original insight into the dynamics of civilization development and nation building the recently formed government of South Africa, the government of Nelson Mandela, has pointed the way out of contradictions, the way out of conflicts and enmities which heretofore had seemed to be inevitable. To avoid the endless sufferings and social retardations inflicted by lies, guilt and pre-occupations with revenge, nations must labor vigorously. The process of striving must be supported systematically and with adequate resources by governments. Since America has not yet matched the South Africans in their recognition of the power of this approach, let us imagine the ghost of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings holding hands as they hover over us. We must strive harder to acquire insights from the emotion laden and sociologically complex legend of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings.

Madam Speaker, let me close by saying that I applaud and congratulate the University of Virginia and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation for a conference which they held on the weekend of March 5 which brought together 20 scholars from all over the Nation to explore the meaning of the relationship of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings for American history, and they intend to publish an entire series of writings on this subject. The University of Virginia and the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation are moving in the right direction to take an objective fact of history and use that fact of history for a very positive purpose. If it helps America to seek reconciliation among the races, then it will have made a great contribution.

Madam Speaker, before we can have reconciliation, we need to have truth, and the truth of the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings is a magnificent truth that should be thoroughly examined.

The article referred to follows:

KINGPINS FOR TRUTH AND RECONCILIATION:
THOMAS AND SALLY

DNA EVIDENCE CONFIRMING JEFFERSON'S RELATIONSHIP WITH SALLY HEMINGS COULD OPEN THE DOOR FOR A MORE PROFOUND DIALOGUE ON SLAVERY AND RACE RELATIONS

Only a few months after the release of the report of the Advisory Board of the President's Initiative on Race entitled *One America In The 21st Century: Forging A New Fu-*

ture, a scientific report has confirmed the likelihood that President Thomas Jefferson was the father of the children of his slave and long-time companion, Sally Hemings. These two events can be constructively related.

The new discussions of the life, philosophy and politics of Thomas Jefferson might do more to facilitate an honest assessment of black-white relations in America than this fact laden official report. Or reviewed together these two developments could greatly enhance our understanding of an extremely complex phenomenon. The weakness of the report of the President's Advisory Board is that it is thorough about the obvious, but it lacks the vital ingredient of profundity. The report is competent, respectful, universal in its coverage, balanced and not at all an embarrassment to the White House; however, when the depth of the deliberations is measured against the complexity of the mission and the intensity of the challenge, the appropriate grade for this noble but feeble effort would be a B- or a C+.

Our national dialogue would be greatly benefitted by the establishment of several adequately funded Commissions on group relations. Native Americans certainly deserve their own separate historical documentation and analysis. African Americans require no less than an objective statement of history, a thorough and comprehensive study, as the basis for unraveling the many complexities of our present interaction with mainstream society. Contrary to the beliefs of many African Americans as well as others, current policy making would be greatly enhanced by a world class study of American slavery and the thwarted reconstruction effort. Such a study would be useful if it is done in the spirit of "truth and reconciliation". The noble embryo that the President's initiative has planted should be allowed to sprout and grow. Using the bully pulpit of the White House the President should call on private Foundations to finance such a world class project, and he should recommend that the world's top scholars and thinkers, including Nobel Prize winners, be recruited to provide research and editorial guidance.

One of the first items that should be placed on the research and analysis agenda is the controversial question of the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. It would be a human interest case study offering great illuminations for American history. It could also be an educational landmark love story that captures the attention of a mass audience and forces them to confront the institution of slavery in all of its dimensions. The scientific validation of Jefferson's paternity with respect to the Hemings children is a historical blockbuster. DNA evidence has exposed the fact that respected academicians and historians have promulgated or tolerated a dangerous and suffocating denial of certain self-evident truths about American history.

This same distortion process applies to too much of American history as it relates to slavery, the civil war and reconstruction. Unlike the very civilized behavior of the new rulers of South Africa, the United States has never had a Truth And Reconciliation Commission. As part of a larger effort the story of Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings could provide a potent spark to generate a bonfire of new revelations which will increase the possibility of long-term improved black-white reconciliation.

The story of Thomas and Sally may be summarized as follows: While Jefferson was serving as the American Ambassador in Paris, Sally Hemings arrived as the maid for his youngest daughter who sailed from Virginia to join her father. Jefferson seduced her and the pregnant Sally returned to

America only after she promised that all of her children would be set free. Under French law she could have remained as a free person in France. During the first year of his presidency a journalist exposed the fact that Jefferson had a slave mistress who was the mother of his children. The third President of the U.S. refused to answer this charge. He also never removed Sally Hemings from Monticello. They were together for 38 years at Monticello until Jefferson died. Three of their children were allowed to "run" and two were set free in Jefferson's will.

With the DNA test confirming Jefferson paternity, the journey, so completely and eloquently begun by Fawn M. Brodie with her best selling Thomas Jefferson: An Intimate History, has now reached its peak. Despite vicious criticisms from the establishment historians still promulgating the Confederate view of American history, Brodie's scholarship propelled the search for truth forward. While the relationship between Jefferson and Hemings was not her primary preoccupation, she provided this story with a rightful proportion of the space, and she integrated it with the rest of her narrative. Brodie's thorough account of Jefferson as a failing business man on the brink of bankruptcy alongside the documentation of the continuous presence of Sally Hemings may both raise and answer an obvious question: Why didn't Jefferson marry a wealthy widow or daughter and end his financial woes?

With an eye more focused, and operating from a court room point-of-view, Annette Gordon-Bennett updates the work of Brodie, and with her remarkable presentation of the evidence, has stimulated the more recent debates which have helped to produce the DNA testing. Now all sides must respond to the scientific evidence. In her book, Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings: An American Controversy, Gordon-Bennett goes on to indict the establishment historians for their gross neglect of vital records.

Barbara Chase Riboud in the novel, Sally Hemings, offers a uniquely constructed and very ambitious fictional attempt to interpret the relationship between Thomas Jefferson and Sally Hemings. Her point-of-view repeatedly emerges crystal clear throughout the novel. Although her writing is often laborious and strained, she sometimes reaches dramatic heights in her depictions of the emotions of her imagined victims of Jefferson's patriarchal and slave owning powers. Chase-Riboud is able to occupy the bodies and souls of Sally and her children, from within them she confronts what she imagines to be the cold blue insensitive eyes of the master of Monticello.

For this novelist Jefferson is a white, Southern aristocrat trapped within the personality parameters of his class and his time. He is also a male chauvinist pig who raped and ruined a young slave girl who is left with no alternative except to "love him to death." Chase-Riboud forces Sally to become a drug to afflict the addict Jefferson til death parts them. The merits of Jefferson's public achievements and historic accomplishments can never offset his intimate behavior flaws in the opinion of this female storyteller of African descent. Each day since the new DNA discovery I read or hear such intense condemnations of Jefferson although they are usually more blunt and crude, and lack the redeeming eloquence of Ms. Chase-Riboud.

This male writer of African descent is compelled to register intense disagreement with Chase-Riboud and any interpretation of the Thomas and Sally relationship that discounts or trivializes Jefferson as an idealist, a visionary, an intellectual, a pragmatic statesman and a crafty Machiavellian politician. The fact that such a giant chose to

keep Sally Hemings at his side for thirty eight years opens the door to a myriad of magnificent questions: Does the length of the relationship, despite the inconvenience caused by public exposure and scandal, clearly show that it was not a lust, but a love relationship? If he did not "love" Sally, then why didn't he just keep her as a concubine while he married a woman of wealth to solve his ever present financial problems? Would a confirmation of his deep love for Sally not clarify a number of other riddles and contradictions related to this "Sphinx"?

The same youthful Jefferson who wrote the Declaration of Independence, with an original draft that condemned slavery, also set forth a racist platform in Notes On The State of Virginia. As a young Congressman he led the fight to stop the spread of slavery into the new states. He stated that slaves had a limited capacity for learning, nevertheless, he urged at one time that slaves should be educated and then set free. In the oppressive social and political environment of Virginia why didn't Jefferson just settle down comfortably as a pure acknowledged racist? In his philosophical restlessness and his discontent with his own public positions one can find the well springs of his greatness. The politician in his pronouncements surrendered to his peers while privately he subscribed to greater truths. His love for Sally was probably a constant internal irritant. This lifelong reverence for his chamber maid is also a legitimate and vital clue to what he personally believed with respect to the equality of the races.

In the Virginia environment where slavery escalated downward into an ever more savage and criminal institution, did Jefferson's attachment to Sally and her children keep the embers of his anti-slavery sentiments burning? If there was some way that we could miraculously recover the missing letters of Jefferson would we find corrections of his most racist utterings? Would we find apologies to Sally Hemings? Would we find expressions of his great love for Sally in his own insightful words?

It is probable that the recent DNA clarification will generate more than new scholarly debates among academicians. More fictional interpretations in poetry, novels, and drama are inevitable in the quest to fill in the gaps of a tale that is about both love and power. The long term fascination of this writer with Jefferson and Hemings has inspired a play which is presently being considered for production and publication. All quotes utilized below in this exposition are taken from the manuscript of the play, Thomas and Sally.

In Act I, Scene 9 of Thomas and Sally, Jefferson recalls his initial seduction of Sally following his wrenching breakup with Maria Cosway in Paris:

Jefferson: Your mind is as splendid as your beautiful face, Sally. Soon, you may become my French teacher. But not today. In my present condition your energy would be too much for me.

Sally: I am so sorry that you have no time to talk to me. When we sit and chat, for a tiny while, you make me feel that it is Christmas morning.

Jefferson: How interesting. You think of Christmas when you talk to me. But always when I see you it is the image of Easter that rises in my mind. Always you remind me of Spring with seeds bursting and flowers blooming. I have been leaving early and I have missed you. Tomorrow we will practice French together again. But not now. Today I am like a dog exhausted after chasing a bone that finally had no meat on it. For some women the ultimate excitement is to lead a man through a maze, forever pulling him at a faster pace until . . . Set the tea down

here, Sally, and leave me. I want to be alone. . . .

Sally: Yes, Marse Tom, I will go. But you look sick, sir. (Begins to walk slowly toward the door while Jefferson lowers his head into his hands again.)

Jefferson: Wait, Sally! (He suddenly raises his head and calls after her.) Come and sit for a minute. (Motions toward a chair near him.) Just for a minute. It is so cold in here.

Sally: (Pushing into the chair.) Yes, Marse Tom, I will sit with you.

Jefferson: It is cold and your eyes are like two suns. Always they seem so bright and full of heat.

Sally: No, Marse Tom, your eyes are bright. I see the sun coming out of your eyes.

Jefferson: What you see in me is the reflection of your own eyes.

Sally: Slaves are not supposed to look into the eyes of masters, but you always make me look into your eyes, Marse Tom. I try hard to turn away, but you make it so hard for me not to look into your eyes. Please excuse me, sir. . . .

Jefferson: I did not mention Maria Cosway. Aha! You have been spying on me, Sally. You are a naughty child.

Sally: Please, Marse Tom, do not call me a child. And I am sorry that I called the name of the English woman. I do not spy on you. But I do watch you. I watch everywhere you go, whatever you do. I listen to everything you say.

Jefferson: I am not angry, Sally. I called you a spy in jest. I have seen you watching me. And you have my permission to call the name of the English woman. We have seen the last of Maria Cosway. I will never follow her through that mysterious maze again.

Sally: Maze? Is that the same as the labyrinth thing, Marse Tom?

Jefferson: A maze, a labyrinth, a wolf-trap, a deadly bear hug, a snare, quicksand in a swamp. She was all of these crushed into one.

Sally: She fiddled with your heart. She led you around the mulberry bush. Maria Cosway was a mean woman, Marse Tom. Marse Tom! Your face is turning red like fire! . . .

Jefferson: (Raising his head abruptly.) Please, Sally, lay your hands on my head again. Massage the back of my neck. Your hands are so warm.

Sally: Yes, Marse Tom, I will rub your head; I will rub your neck. Come back to life, Marse Tom. Do not leave me!

Jefferson: (Abruptly standing and pushing Sally down until he towers over her and gazes down at her with a look of astonishment.) Two suns are set in your eyes. And those same eyes are filled with Virginia. There is no limit to what your eyes can hold. I see the world when it first came. I see the world going on forever. It is all there without embellishment, without ornaments. It's all there shining in your eyes. It shines even through your tears. (Bends down to kiss her head. She responds by throwing her arms around his long legs.) . . .

At the end of a failed attempt to separate him from Sally by banning her from the Monticello mansion the two lovers are united:

Scene thirteen: Sally joins Jefferson in the bedroom. Jefferson is first alone. He has placed a light in a small window above his bed.

Jefferson: Come, sweet Sally, and bring me peace. The force of my feeling gives me direction. Let it be disease, affliction, addiction; you are a habit I will pursue. No surgeon can cut me free of you. If I am blind then I never want to see. If this is rape then I declare that all husbands, with their wedding night madness, are similarly guilty. Thomas and Sally are one. In what language

does God require the marriage license? Is he satisfied to see the vows written on men's hearts; or do only wedding gowns and hypocritical ceremonies move him? Am I condemned because of my oath of monogamy is unregistered? Is it some base perversion that leads me to discern that nothing is more delicious than fidelity?

(Sally emerges from the floor climbing up from the stairs at the foot of Jefferson's bed. She is draped in a black cloak on the upper part of her body but below the knees a white night gown can be seen.)

Jefferson: (Throwing open his arms as he moves toward her.) Ma Cherie! My magnificent flower!

Sally: (Leaping into his arms.) Like a baby rabbit racing for its mother I came running. Please excuse me but my legs leaped forward all on their own. I could not hold back one minute more. I have waited so long for the lamp in the window to light my way back to you.

Jefferson: Please forgive me. You have been humiliated for the last time. I beg you! Forgive me! (Falls to his knees and throws his arms around her legs.)

Sally: Mon Cher, please don't greet me on your knees. Don't drown my mind in fancy pleas. Just squeeze me close. (He rises and envelopes her in his arms.) Speak to me with the strength in your hands and arms. I have been a lost orphan without your love to surround me.

Jefferson: My Sweet Angel, look at Monticello. (Begins to speak French.) C'est un château très incomplete. Mais un jour, je le finirai totalement. Monticello est ton château, Sally. You will never be driven from your castle again. I swear it to you, sweet Sally. You demand nothing but this is my gift to you. No one, not even Martha, shall ever take Monticello away from you again. I swear it!

Sally: Please do not swear again. I do not need another oath. Make no promises except one.

Promise you will love me like the green grass grows. The grass is forever.

Jefferson: I will love you forever, Sally. We are one. Now, tell me that you forgive me. Promise that you will love me forever.

Sally: Oh my sweet Cher, how can I answer you? I can't match your basket of fancy words. Just look into my eyes and read all of your answers. You see my pain. You alone know how much I hurt. I can see the understanding in your eyes. The heavy beating of your heart is sending me a message. As much as I have missed you, you have missed me. You still Love me. The election, your daughters, the planters, the guests; nothing has been enough to block your path back to me. The message is so simple, Mon Cher. You still love me. And I promise to love you forever.

Jefferson: The world is as it is. Let the violent variables swirl around us in chaos. You, sweet Angel, shall be my constant. Everlasting you are mine!

Sally: You have recited enough of your sweet speeches tonight. Take me to our bed. Your cold sheets are waiting to be warmed. (Sally takes off her black cloak and stands in her white nightgown before Jefferson carries her to the bed.)

In Act I, Scene 25, Jefferson is forced to justify his love for Sally to his jealous daughter, Martha:

Martha: I did not like her. Perhaps I was jealous of every female in your life. But Maria Cosway was an elegant lady. Sally was nothing. You remade Sally. Why did you select Sally?

Jefferson: An architect can read his own blueprint easily; but it is not always possible for a man to decipher his soul.

Martha: You told her the right books to read in your library. You coached her until

she learned to speak French better than me. You let her reign supreme over all the servants. Sally was nothing but mud. But you diligently molded her into your favorite statue.

Jefferson: To some degree maybe I did mold her. But God alone could teach her to burst into a room like a morning glory; to bloom as the reddest rose commanding every eye; to stand as the sunflower in every crowd; to always be the lily who lights up a dark pond of tears. Sally is what nature and God and I have made together. And so is Patsy. You are separate and distinct but blessed be the priceless two of you. Sally extracts nothing from Patsy.

Martha: Why love, Father? Why not just let it be lust? The South is littered with mulattos but white men don't treat their mothers like wives.

Jefferson: Tonight, Patsy, I beg you to be my daughter. I have only two of you. I have hundreds of inquisitors. Do not insult me. Do not degrade me with conventional accusations. If you have ears, then hear me. I need more than pleasure! Watching loved ones die maims the spirit, cripples the soul; even the strongest among us are never fully rehabilitated. There is but one antidote to such despair and most men never find her. Life and joy are for the living (pauses) but we disabled souls require magnificent assistance. Sally is my magnificent assistance. Inspiration is that which completes a man; supplies drive and ambition; stimulates vision; absorbs despair. She who inspires is sacred. Sally is sacred.

The fact that an aging Jefferson could not separate himself from Sally raises questions less about sexual addiction and more about the magic and magnetism of Sally Hemings. She obviously had more than her beautiful body to offer. Why are all records of Sally so thoroughly and meticulously missing? In his seventies and eighties why did Jefferson still find her company indispensable? Since her continued existence posed an obvious embarrassing threat to Jefferson's heirs, how did Sally manage to outwit them and survive? And is it not obvious that both the father and the mother had to be involved in the arrangements made for the big city survival of their children who were allowed to "run"? For a lifetime Thomas and Sally did more than merely sleep together. But what was it that made Sally "sacred" in the eyes of Jefferson?

All traces of Sally Hemings have been scrubbed from Jefferson's writings and from history. Fiction writers thus have great latitude in the challenge to recreate this central character. She may be glimpsed through her own speeches:

In Act I, Scene 16, on the day she learns of the public charges that she is the President's mistress and the mother of his children:

Sally: Marse Tom don't want to know what's happening here. Marse Tom won't look down at the dirt. Marse Tom rather gaze up at the skies. He always goes in person to buy slaves. But you won't see him around when slaves are sold. But Marse Tom is many men all squeezed into one. He is the owl and the eagle, the fox and the sheep, rose and thorn, still pond and flooding river. God was straining hard the day he made Marse Tom . . . The closer you watch Marse Tom, the less you understand him. I have seen him wave his hand at heaven and thumb his nose at the angels. But some days he takes oaths and swears under the watchful eyes of God. So much about him stays in the dark. But why must we figure out the puzzle? Why do you ask so many questions Millie? I just know in my bones that Marse Tom is the grandest man that walks on this earth. . . .

Preacher Zeke: They say Marse Tom could be pushed out of office. They say nobody will

vote for him a second time. This is bad, Miss Sally. Look right there in the paper. They called you a concubine!

Sally: Our love is right, Preacher. Your God, our Jesus smiles down on Thomas and Sally. The newspapers are all wrong and our love is right. He will not bend, Preacher. Marse Tom will stand and fight.

Preacher Zeke: Chief Justice Marshall, Patrick Henry, John Adams! They have all come out against Marse Tom.

Sally: You hear a hundred dirty puppies howling at the heels of a mountain lion. My Master will never bow to them. You watch, Preacher Zeke. Watch and see him strike with quiet lightning. He will leave the puppies scattered across the woods. He will stand in this storm. Pray to make him strong. The God who gave me my love will not tease me and then take him away. The Almighty who made me a slave would not torture me twice. Pray the right prayer, Preacher. Make him like David against Goliath; like Daniel in the lion's den; let him be Samson. Give him the jawbone of an ass and let him beat the Philistines down. For our love he will go up to the gates of heaven and wrestle St. Peter himself. Pray, Preacher, pray!

Millie: Preacher Zeke, do they put corcupines in jail?

Sally: Concubine, Millie? Not corcupine! The word is concubine! Any woman that is used but not loved is a concubine. Many waives are concubines. I am not a concubine . . .

In Act I, Scene 24, Sally confronts Jefferson's daughter:

Martha: You are both reckless! Love has nothing to do with it. My Father is first of all a man and men are prone to allow their lust to place everything else in jeopardy.

Sally: Be careful what you label lust. Lust is an easy pig to feed. Men can drop their pants anywhere. My love gives life to him. He says that he can sometimes only heal his headaches by placing his head in my hands. He calls me his magic and his medicine. . . .

Martha: Yes, I hear you as a woman, tonight. But all these years I have worked so hard to make you a thing. I could not admit my Father had succumbed to a mere woman. You had to be a soft, fuzzy, lustful creature that he took to bed to keep himself warm; a witch to cure his manly madness; a slop jar for his boiling male juices; a submissive sheep; a ravishing werewolf; I made you anything in my mind but a woman. You could not be human.

Sally: Not human, Martha? But we played together as girls. We have lived for twenty-three years within each other shadows. I am your mother's slave sister, her half sister. The father of your mother was my father. You are my niece, Martha.

Martha: Stop it! Don't remind me of the disgusting lust of my maternal grandfather. Let me forget how our lives are intermingled, miscegenated and tied together like insane serpents.

Sally: Consider the serpents, Martha. In the Spring when certain snakes mate, they wrap themselves around each other with passion. And neither snake supplies the poison to ruin their great hug. You come to the love feast with fangs, Martha! You bring the poison!

Martha: Stop judging me! We are not as the gates of heaven—and you are not St. Peter. You are not an angel merely because you are a slave. Other women suffer too!

Sally: Yes, Martha, admit it. We are both women. But after tonight we will never suffer together again. Thomas Jefferson is your Father. I give him all to you. To take him from me, day and night you tear at him with sharp hooks in his mind. Every axe and dagger you use. Sometimes you dump a heavy

load of reminders about your mother. Sometimes you paint me as a demon. I am unlawful, illegal, sinful, the Jezebel dragging him down to hell. But your spray of poison has not put out my Master's passion. Our love is like an iron rock against all of your heavy hammers. I win the battles but you keep fighting the war. You can not take him from me. No woman can take him from me—no daughter, no Washington ladies with all of their lace and lovely speeches. No ghost of a wife long gone. You have all failed. You can not take him, He is mine! And since he is all mine I have the power to give him to you. (Begins to cry.) For his sake I give him to you. Take your Father and let me go!

Martha: Sally, Father will be here soon. Perhaps you should rest. You should not meet him with tears.

Sally: Take him! To get at me you are driving him mad. You will split his soul right down the middle. Preacher Zeke tells the story of two women before King Solomon both claiming a baby. Like the real mother standing before Solomon my love is bigger than yours. Your Father has been split in half too long. Take him! He should not have to wake up each day and choose between me and you. I am my own butcher. I choose to cut him free. I want him made whole again. The country still needs him undivided. I stand on one side and all the world weighs down against me. So heavy a sin will surely drag me to the bottom of hell. . . .

In Act I, Scene 26, declaring that she will leave Monticello, Sally confronts Jefferson:

Jefferson: Liberty and freedom are necessary to guarantee the opportunity to love. Around your waist in a pouch are the papers that validate freedom for you and each child. You are not my slave, Sally, You don't have to stay if you do not love me.

Sally: In the dark you whisper over and over again that you love me; at night I am your adored wife. But in the morning I am again just a slave. At night I am everything. In the morning I am nothing. Monticello you declared to be my castle but when company comes I am the pussy cat who must crawl into a corner or go hide in the bushes.

Jefferson: You stab with a long rusty knife!

Sally: Hear me til the sound of my voice makes you want to puke. And then maybe you will never ever want to hear my voice again.

Jefferson: You speak from great pain, Sally. I honor your suffering.

Sally: To be a slave, night black or mulatto, is to live always in pain. The days creep by so slowly for a slave—and there is nothing to look forward to but more misery tomorrow. If we slaves were wise we would punish all slave owners by killing ourselves and destroying their property. If slaves had a democratic government we would all go to the polls and cast our ballots for a holiday of destruction; a grand day of death. . . .

Jefferson: Forgive me, Sally. I have written in riddles and traveled in evasive circles for too long. I swear I will someday set these matters straight.

Sally: If you are truly my champion—and since you are the powerful President of the United States, I most reverently appeal to you to publicly whip the man who wrote these words that I have copied from his book: (She reads from a piece of paper.) "Among the blacks is misery enough, God knows, but no poetry; in imagination they are dull, tasteless, and anomalous on. They secrete less by the kidneys, and more by the glands of the skins, which give them a very strong and disagreeable odor". . . .

Sally: And you will promise never to be mad at me for doing what it was right to do. (Pause) I have a gift for you, Mon Cher, a gift I bought in a Paris flea market. I bought

this from an old African who was selling carvings. He had a big head and a face that could only have been chiseled by a very strong angel. He was tall with big hands and long bony fingers. (Pulls the cloth covering from a small black stone carving.) See, it is a tiny family of a man, his wife and two children—the way families must have been before the slave catchers came. Take it! It was dreamed up by an inferior "dull, tasteless" black mind, and carved with inferior black physical fingers. Take it and always remember that the Sally you once adored was first of all a slave. I am Black Sally!

Jefferson: Thank you Sally. But please do not remind me that the trial is over.

Sally: I sentence you to one day write that any being able to bear the daily burdens of slavery and still be able to laugh and to love is surly superior to all other human beings.

Jefferson: I swear that I shall truthfully instruct posterity and work to shield them from the errors committed by my generation.

Sally: Say no more. (Holds a finger up to her lip.)

Jefferson: As you wish, my divine inquisitor. The nobility of Adam is best reflected by the fact that he made no attempt to argue with his God. Adam quietly acknowledged his guilt and he left the Garden of Eden. . . .

In Act I, Scene 27, Sally reverses her decision to run away from Monticello:

Sally: I could take my children and live anywhere. I could mop floors as a maid, or melt away in sweat cooking in some lady's kitchen; or I would do well as a seamstress. I could put plenty of food on my table for my children. Black Sally could survive. But there would be no thread tough enough, no needle big enough to sew up the aching hole in my heart.

Martha: I promise you peace Sally. I shall never again harass or insult you. In no way will I ever block or handicap you in your pursuit of happiness at Monticello.

Sally: The slave in me is beaten down and bitter, but I can never be happy unless I stay hostage to my heart. Against the hurricane of the heart the head is like a crippled fly. This morning when I got out of bed I knew in my bones that I had lost the battle. No woman can love him, be loved by him, and them pick up and run away from Thomas Jefferson. It would take an angel or some other being able to work miracles to carry out such a deed. I'm only a woman. I love him. I can't abandon him. (She takes up a pen and begins scribbling a note.)

Martha: In the end we must always remember that we are only women; incomplete and not fully made without our men.

Sally: We are women, and men are not fully finished until we make them so.

In Act II, Scene 3, Sally comforts an old, sick and dying Jefferson:

Jefferson: My dearest Magic Woman, now you are so kind as to assign me another son when I have refused to claim the sons you gave me.

Sally: I didn't come to talk about that. Your morning is cloudy enough already. Accept Edward Coles as a son from you soul and celebrate.

Jefferson: Why accept a son who publicly chides me and privately mocks me with flattery.

Sally: Sons do sometimes rebel and challenge their fathers.

Jefferson: And sometimes children hate their fathers. I have given ample cause to your Thomas and Harriet and Beverly and Eston and Madison. Toward my own flesh I have behaved abominably!

Sally: (Screaming) Stop it! The world is as it is. In a great burst of love you gave my children life. And later you gave them their freedom. I asked for nothing else. You must

not torture yourself! If my children have suffered it is because they were abandoned by their mother who wouldn't carry them all at once to freedom because she couldn't bear to leave her lover.

Jefferson: My loud and powerful queen, I beg you not to scream at this old man. My conscience is crammed with sins that break out like blisters. Brains overloaded with living and learning become grotesque. That I sometimes become unhinged should not surprise you. Wrinkled hearts and musty minds are not good company. Wise women do not waste their love on old men.

Sally: (almost whispering) Then I never want to be a wise woman. Let me die a fool! Loving an old man is like loving a baby. It is the best used time of your life. No need to have a reason. The love just swells up all inside you and then runs over in a flood. (She kneels beside his chair and begins to caress and kiss him). . . .

As much as he was the author of the Declaration of Independence, the third President of the United States and the purchaser of the Louisiana Territory, Thomas Jefferson was also the concerned father of several children of African descent. With unfortunate limitations and restraints the evidence is that Jefferson loved his common-law wife and children. He was not a brilliant, cold blooded beast. The hypocrisy he felt compelled to perpetrate certainly created a personal life wracked with intense conflicts.

Jefferson's public statements on race and slavery often stand in opposition to his private passion and compassion; however, when his intimate relationship with Sally is affixed to selected public actions, it is clear that he consciously made a vital contribution to the abolition of slavery. There are many who contend that without Jefferson there could never have been an emancipating Abraham Lincoln. Congressman Jefferson attempted to halt the expansion of slavery into new states and failed by one vote in the House of Representatives. As President he narrowly won a victory for a law that finally ended the legal importation of slaves. It is also important to note that Jefferson's advocacy for the rights of the common white man had to take roots before Lincoln could fight the war that freed the slaves.

Jefferson was quoted by the slave mongers as well as the Abolitionists as they made their cases. Until today he is still cited by racists as well as progressives. The new DNA clarification of his paternity of Sally Hemings' children may finally end this ideological tug of war. In a superficial response the racists may jettison the man who treated the slave mother of his children as if she was his wife.

A more profound response from progressives in general, and African Americans specifically, would be a new celebration of Jefferson as the pre-requisite to Lincoln. It is a historical fact that one of Jefferson's proteges, Edward Coles, took his slaves from Virginia to Illinois where he gave them their freedom and acres of land. Coles later became Governor of Illinois; defeated a referendum seeking to make Illinois a slave state; and was an active politician in Illinois at the time of Lincoln's election and the Civil War. More than mere words and ideas linked Lincoln to Jefferson.

Celebrations of the new Jefferson discoveries, and expressions of gratitude to the science of genetics which produced DNA testing are very much in order. What the historians and researchers of several generations refused to examine objectively has now been determined to be almost certainly true. The white male southern academicians who have dominated the interpretation of pre and post civil war history have now been thoroughly discredited. Their refusal to accept overwhelming evidence with respect to Jefferson,

of necessity, raises serious questions about the integrity of the rest of their scholarship.

Some obvious indictments of these proponents of the Confederate view of history are now in order: The establishment historians are guilty of ignoring the record of widespread miscegenation fostered by White men and its implications. Mainstream scholars have refused to offer any meaningful expositions of the "breeding farm" industry. On the other hand post civil war terrorism and violence by the defeated rebels has been glorified. "The Birth Of A Nation" interpretation has never been answered by academicians with a true and thorough story of the terrorism, murder and mayhem which returned the blacks of the South to a state of semi-slavery.

WHERE ARE THE DRUGS COMING FROM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come again tonight to the floor of the House of Representatives as chair of the new Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources to talk about a situation that is confronting our Nation, Congress and has touched almost every household in America, and that is the situation dealing with illegal narcotics. The situation basically is out of control and affects our young people. Some 14,200 Americans died last year because of drug-related deaths. This is a problem that has been swept under the table by Congress, by this administration and not really addressed adequately in my opinion. As chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources responsible for developing at least the House side of our national policy, I intend to continue my efforts to bring this situation to the attention of the American people and to my colleagues here.

Mr. Speaker, the situation is so bad relating to narcotics, particularly among our young people, that the statistics are absolutely staggering and should shock every American, particularly in the area of hard drug use by our young people. The statistics since 1993, when this administration came into power, of drug use among our teens and our young people, the instance of use of heroin by our teenage population has soared 875 percent.

In the area that I come from, Central Florida, a relatively prosperous area, an area that has economic stability, growth, viability, no inner city problems, our area has been absolutely wracked and ravaged by deaths, particularly again among our young people, our teenage population and young adults by heroin deaths. In fact, in the Orlando Sentinel, a headline at the end of last year said that the drug overdose deaths in Central Florida exceed homicides.

One of my first duties and responsibilities as chair of this new subcommittee to deal with drug policy was to conduct a hearing in Central Florida

on the issue, and I was told by the father of one of the young people who died of a drug overdose, a heroin overdose, "Mr. Mica, those who have died from drug overdoses are in fact homicides." And that situation is repeating itself across our land.

Not only do we see increased use of heroin among our young people and in my area and other areas, we are now seeing more and more Mexican black tar, high purity heroin, coming across the border into Texas and other border States. Additionally, the amounts of methamphetamines coming into middle America, the western States and across this land are soaring dramatically. The episodes in our emergency rooms from overdoses across the land are increasing, not decreasing, and again we are seeing more and more of the drug abuse of these hard, high-purity drugs such as cocaine, heroin, methamphetamines among our young population.

Tonight I wanted to spend most of my time talking to my colleagues that are listening and the American people that are listening about where those drugs are coming from, and it is very easy for me to identify where those drugs are coming from.

If I may, if we could pay attention to this chart, it is very easy to see that the drugs are coming from South America, primarily Colombia where heroin and now cocaine from coca production have increased since this administration has stopped equipment or stopped in the last few years equipment reaching Colombia, helicopters, ammunition, eradication equipment reaching that country. Incredible fields of poppies are being grown in Colombia, and now we are told that Colombia is also the largest source of coca production in the world, exceeding even Peru and Bolivia, which both countries have managed to curtail some of their production. But it is coming through Colombia and then transiting through Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, today 60 to 70 percent of the hard drugs entering the United States of America enter through Mexico, and this chart shows the pattern of Mexican and Colombian based organized crimes, crime in the 1990's and currently. So, again we know exactly where these drugs are being produced, and we know who is producing them, and we know who is trafficking in those drugs.

Let me use, if I may, a quote that disturbed me as chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, and this is a quote from our chief DEA administrator. He said, and let me repeat it, in testimony: Recently in my lifetime I have never witnessed any group of criminals that has had such a terrible impact on so many individuals and communities in our Nation. Mr. Constantine said corruption among Mexican anti-drug authorities was unparalleled with anything I have seen in 39 years of police work.

This is our chief drug enforcement officer for the Nation, and these are his comments.

Now it would be bad enough to hear that from our DEA chief enforcement officer, but all we have to do is as a Congress look at the statistics about what is happening with Mexico. We look to see how our partner, how our friend, how our ally is cooperating in the war on drugs in the effort to stop the trafficking and production of illegal narcotics.

Let me address two fronts. First of all, Mexico, which was a minor producer of heroin, has now become a major producer of heroin, so they are producing heroin and in larger quantities than they ever have and at a higher deadly purity rate than we have ever seen before. The second area that we would judge countries' cooperation with the United States in dealing with the drug problem would be the amount of drugs that are seized in that particular country, and that is how we base our certification of a country in cooperating and making them eligible for foreign assistance, international finance and international trade benefits.

What are the other measures? As I said, first of all, again production and then trafficking. In trafficking the statistics are absolutely startling. In 1998 the seizures for heroin fell in Mexico, the seizures for cocaine and coca products fell in Mexico. So the major hard drugs in Mexico actually in the area of seizures decreased in Mexico, so they were actually assisting us less in seizing hard drugs coming across the border.

Then if we look at the other dangerous deadly drug that we have talked about as methamphetamine, we find that not only the drug, but the ingredients and the precursors to produce and traffic in methamphetamine, another deadly hard drug today that is taking its toll on so many young Americans, is also up, production is up, incidents of finding this across our land are up.

Now I spoke very briefly about the process of certification of a country, and there is confusion among the Congress and lack of knowledge about the certification process. I was able in the 1980's, as chief of staff for Senator Hawkins, to work with Senator Hawkins, Members of the other body in Congress and this side, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and others who were here, the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), and the Congress adopted a drug certification law. That is a simple law, and what it does again is it says that any country who deals in illegal narcotics shall be certified annually by the Department of State and the President of the United States as, and the terms in the law are very specific, as fully cooperating to do again two things. One, to stop the production; and two, to stop the trafficking.

Now that is the certification. The administration and the President must certify to Congress that these countries that are dealing in illegal narcotics are in fact cooperating with us,

fully cooperating with us to stop the production and trafficking, a simple law, a simple certification. And what do those countries get in return for their cooperation and being fully certified? Mr. Speaker, they get basically several benefits.

The first of these would be United States foreign assistance. So if they are fully cooperating, they get United States foreign assistance, foreign aid. They also would get foreign assistance as far as international financial benefit and support. So in the World Bank, Inter-American Development Bank, IMF, the United States, which is the major underwriting partner for financing all of these international operations and actually the basis of financial stability for so many countries, including Mexico, the United States lends its vote to approve various loans and grants and assistance from these international finance organizations. So that is another criterion.

□ 1815

Then the third area is the trade area. We give trade benefits. I cannot think of any nation in the world that we have given a better trade advantage to.

We have different levels of trade equity but there certainly is an inequity between the United States, between our wages, between our labor standards, between our environmental standards, between all the things we judge trade equity and economic equity, there is a disparity between the United States and Mexico. Stop and think that we passed NAFTA giving that country some of the best trade benefits ever bestowed by any government to any other nation or ally. We give, in fact, those trade benefits to Mexico and we ask very little in return. In fact, we have almost a \$16 billion trade deficit, and our trade deficit in the United States and I plan to hold a hearing on this issue because it is another issue that has not received the adequate attention or concern by the Congress or its appropriate committees, but the deficit has now ballooned. It is in orbit, the highest it has ever been, trade deficit.

That is, the United States is buying more foreign goods than selling those goods. Only for so long can the United States continue to have this incredible hundred billion dollars in excess flowing out year after year from the policies of this administration, but that is one more benefit that we gave to Mexico and they are benefitting by the trade surplus that they experience in selling us their goods, again, produced at a different level. So all of these benefits are given to the country of Mexico.

In return, we ask very little and, in fact, we go through this certification process every year to say who is helping us and who is not assisting us and should they get trade foreign assistance benefits. That brings me to the topic that I wanted to raise tonight, and that is the question of certification

of Mexico and what is going on with our Mexican allies.

Are they cooperating? I just read the quote by Tom Constantine, who is the Director of our Drug Enforcement Agency, very harshly critical of what is going on in Mexico. Two years ago, this Congress stumbled and part of it was because of Wall Street weighing in. They were concerned with this big trade agreement, that there might be some repercussions and American businesses have now invested in Mexico and the interconnection of these economic relationships by decertifying Mexico there could be some implication, and they extended the real meaning of decertification and have since, with the cooperation of the administration, turned this into a political process rather than a policy process of this Congress and how it extends benefits to other countries. Again, those benefits trade financial assistance and economic benefits in regard to international organizations. So that has been distorted and the process is distorted.

Two years ago, this Congress concerned about the certification of Mexico at that point, passed a resolution and asked Mexico to do several things to help end this war, if it was to be a joint war, but to take certain very specific actions but not unreasonable requests to deal with the narcotics problem that was just as bad then as it is today. In fact, it has gotten worse today as a result of nothing being done by Mexico to address the specific concerns of this Congress.

Many people who were here several years ago remember what we asked Mexico to do in a cooperative fashion. First we asked for extradition of Mexican officials who were involved in drug activities. We asked for extradition of the drug traffickers who were charged and we asked for the arrest in Mexico, by Mexicans, of major drug traffickers. So we asked for extradition of those who were involved in illegal narcotics activities at the highest level, major drug traffickers; and we asked for, again, cooperation in trying to bring under control some of the corruption that existed in Mexico at various levels of their government.

A second thing we asked for was Mexico to sign a maritime agreement with the United States. A maritime agreement is important because if we look again at this chart we can see the drugs travel not only overland but also through some of the water areas that surround Mexico, and United States officials and United States enforcement officers who work off of this coast, in even our military, have no rights, no maritime agreement. Mexico is the only country in this region with which the United States does not have a maritime agreement except, I believe, Haiti.

The only reason we have not had one with Haiti is because the administration has done such a great job with their system of justice down there,

where we spent three or four billion dollars, and the parliament has not met and we have had basically a dictatorship that refuses to operate in a legitimate fashion. So we have a parliament or a Congress in Haiti that basically has not been able to meet and approve a maritime agreement, but that is not the case in Mexico, even though what has happened in Haiti in not signing an agreement with the disorganization of their government, with the pouring of billions of U.S. dollars into that pit, we have a different situation, a different set of circumstances with Haiti and that failure as opposed to the Mexican record of failure and failing to sign or come to terms on a maritime agreement. That is number two.

We asked for radar in the south. Now, of course, if we just look at this chart again we see that the drugs are coming in through Mexico through the southern border and transiting through their country. A simple request still not adhered to.

The fourth request was to enforce some of the laws that had been passed. Now, we did get Mexico to pass some tougher laws several years back, but it is nice to have a law. The question is enforcing the law.

What happened when we asked for cooperation? Last year, our agents uncovered an incredibly large activity relating to money laundering in Mexico. The scope of it was mind-boggling and hundreds of millions of dollars being laundered through Mexican banks. We arranged for a sting operation and Mexican banks customers were arrested. What did the Mexicans do? Did they cooperate with us, enforcing the law as we had asked 2 years ago in money laundering and corruption? No, they did not. In fact, the Mexicans had the audacity to blast the United States and then threaten to indict our Customs officials. This is an operation known as Casa Blanca.

So here again was another item, the fourth item that we had asked for cooperation from Mexico; two years ago, and the situation is worse than it was then.

An additional item that we asked for, a simple request, was our agents, our DEA agents who work around the world, particularly where there are international narcotics problems and they are welcomed by most host countries. What did Mexico do to a request that they secure protection, they allow our agents to arm themselves and that we also increase the presence of those agents in that country for the purpose of conducting investigations with Mexican officials? What they did was really take little or no action. We still have a cap on those agents and our agents still do not have the protection they need.

So these are a few of the basic requests this House of Representatives asked Mexico 2 years ago to comply with to assist us.

□ 1830

Again, nothing, at most very little, has been done.

What disturbs me the most about the situation with Mexico is that instead of getting better on any front, the situation becomes worse and worse.

Tonight, before the House of Representatives, I am going to read most of the article that appeared in today's New York Times, and I ask every Member of Congress who tomorrow will receive a copy of this article from me to take time to read this article.

We have been concerned about corruption in Mexico at the highest levels. We have been concerned that this administration made decisions about certification not based on facts, not based on intelligence information, but based on diplomacy and also in trying to protect United States officials which I believe have covered up a horrible situation. This article that I am going to read tonight that appeared in The New York Times by Tim Golden, again I refer to every Member of Congress and ask that they pay particular attention to its contents, because its contents is very damaging to what has taken place regarding Mexico.

Mr. Speaker, let me, if I may, read this. I will try to read most of the article. I think again it deserves our attention, and it was written today. This is not something that is dated.

"Early last year as undercover United States Customs agents neared the end of the biggest inquiry ever conducted into the illegal movement of drug money, bankers working with Mexico's most powerful cocaine cartel approached them with a stunning offer. The agents, posing as money-launderers from Colombia, had insinuated themselves deeply into the Mexican underworld, helping the traffickers hide more than \$60 million. Now money-men working with the cartel said they had clients who needed to launder \$1.5 billion more. The most important of those clients," they said, now listen to this, "was Mexico's Minister of Defense.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to point out in looking at this article that "early last year" means this is around the time we were about to certify Mexico as cooperating, and I think that is really important. The gentleman called my attention to this article. This is not something that is historic; this is something that was happening while on the floor of this Congress. We had Members down here saying they were cooperating, and that is important, I think, in the context of what the gentleman is reading here. This was going on while we are here saying, oh, things are going fine.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana not only for

his comments, but also for his continued interest in trying to bring to the attention of the American people the situation relating to Mexico's involvement in this drug matter.

Again, the point being here, these drug dealers said that they had a client who needed to launder \$1.5 billion more. Most important, those clients, one of those clients, they said, was Mexico's Minister of Defense.

"The Customs agents didn't know whether the money really existed, or if any of it belonged to the Minister, General Enrique Cervantes, officials said. But having heard about American intelligence reports, pointing to corruption at the high levels of the Mexican military, the agents were mystified by what happened next.

"Rather than continue the undercover operation to pursue the deal, Clinton administration officials ordered that it be shut down on schedule several weeks later. No further effort was ever made to investigate the offer, and officials said that prosecutors have not even raised the matter with the suspects in the case who have pleaded guilty and who are cooperating with authorities."

Let me read this quote: "Why are we sitting on this kind of information, asked the former senior Customs agent who led the undercover inquiry," and that agent was William F. Gately. "It's either because we are lazy, we are stupid, or the political will doesn't exist to engage in the kind of investigation where our law enforcement efforts might damage our foreign policy."

So here we have the question of whether or not we should have, and our officials should have, pursued this matter of corruption at the very highest levels, and in fact, it may have been compromised for the sake of damaging our foreign policy or our diplomacy, or our relations with Mexico.

"Senior officials denied," and I will continue reading, that foreign policy had influenced their decision to end the operation, saying they had been moved primarily by concerns for its security. They also emphasized that the agents had been unable to verify the Mexican traffickers' claims.

"Other officials of the administration, which has based much of its Mexican drug strategy on collaboration with General Cervantes, said they were confident that he was above reproach. A spokesman for the Ministry of Defense, Lieutenant Francisco Aguilar Hernandez, dismissed the traffickers' proposal as self-serving lies."

But now listen to this part of this story: "But a detailed account of the case, based on confidential government documents, court records, and dozens of interviews, suggests that United States officials walked away from an extraordinary opportunity to examine allegations of the official corruption that is considered the main obstacle to anti-drug efforts in Mexico."

Basically, they walked away from the investigation.

"For nearly a decade, American officials have been haunted by the spectacle of Mexican officials being linked to illicit activities soon after they are embraced in Washington. And just weeks before the Customs investigation known as Operation Casablanca", which I referred to earlier, "which ended last year, administration officials received intelligence reports indicating that the Mexican military's ties to the drug trade were more serious than had been previously thought. But when faced with the possibility that one of Washington's critical Mexican allies might be linked to the traffickers, the official gave the matter little consideration. They said they opted for a sure thing, arresting mid-level traffickers and their associates, and at least disrupting the money-laundering system that drug gangs had set up. To reach for a general, they asserted, would have added to their risk with no certainty of success.

"Obviously, it was a significant allegation, the Commissioner of Customs, Raymond W. Kelly, said in an interview. But he added, there was skepticism about it. Was it puffing? It just was not seen as being, I wouldn't use the word credible, but it wasn't verified.

Quote: "When senior administration officials announced the stink last May, they took a triumphant inventory: The indictments of three big Mexican banks and bankers from a dozen foreign banks and the arrest of 142 suspects, the confiscation of \$35 million in drug profits, and the seizing of accounts holding \$66 million more. The officials claimed that the success was a result of a long-standing administration fight against money-laundering. But Mr. Gately, who retired from the Customs Service on December 31, said his investigation had run the gauntlet of resistance from the start.

"The Justice Department, uncomfortable with cases in which undercover agents laundered more money for drug traffickers than they ultimately seized, was imposing new limits on the time that such operations could run and the money they would launder, officials said. And though the restrictions did not apply to Customs, a branch of Treasury, Justice Department officials continued to play strong skeptical roles in supervising cases throughout the government.

"One Federal official who spoke on the condition of anonymity admitted that he had initially dismissed Mr. Gately's plan. 'You're out of your mind', the official remembered saying. Several colleagues said it was the sort of response that Mr. Gately, 49 years of age, tended to see as a challenge. A decorated former Marine who enlisted for service in Vietnam at 17, he had already been at the center of several cases that mixed internal struggle and public success. Friends and critics described him in similar terms: Driven, sometimes abrasive, and usually creative.

"After leading an investigation that revealed ties between the Italian Mafia and Colombian cocaine cartels, Mr. Gately cowrote a 1994 book about the case, *Dead Ringer*, that cast him as a lonely crusader surrounded by small-minded bureaucrats. 'It is the story of one man who refused to succumb to corruption,' the prologue reads, 'who believed in his oath and mission and the consequences he paid for believing in what he was doing.'

"As the senior Customs drug investigator in Los Angeles, Mr. Gately said he first heard from a confidential source in 1993 about an important shift in the way that Mexican and Colombian drug traffickers were converting cash into funds that could be freely spent. The source said, 'Traffickers were depositing their money with corrupt Mexican bankers who sent it back to them in almost untraceable cashier's checks drawn on American accounts that the Mexican banks used to do business with in the United States.' Mr. Gately hoped his source could infiltrate that system, collecting cash from drug wholesalers in the United States, and wiring it to corrupt bankers in Mexico.

"The bankers would issue drafts for the money and Customs would develop evidence against the suspects on both ends of the transaction. Many Customs officials, however, doubted that the ruse would work. Drug enforcement agents wanted to use the source in another case. Because the man had a criminal past, one Federal prosecutor opposed using him at all and threatened to indict him on a 10-year-old case. Even when Mr. Gately was eventually able to recruit another undercover intermediary, a Colombian known by the pseudonym, Javier Ramirez, he and others, said a senior Justice Department official", and this is very important, "Mary Warren, pressed him to limit the operation's scope."

So we have an official in the Department of Justice pressing him to limit the scope of this operation.

"What she wanted to know was when was this going to be over," he said of Ms. Warren, "who declined to comment. What was our end game?"

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to recognize the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, one of my concerns when I read this article and in listening to the gentleman go through this is that we on the Committee on Government Reform, we have heard some of this type of thing before, that the constant trying to limit investigations, trying to cut it off, it is a very disturbing pattern that this administration seems to have when they are investigating things that are very uncomfortable regarding their policy.

It is not clear who and where this decision was being made by. We do not know whether it is coming out of the White House or whether at the top of the Justice Department; much like in

the Indian casinos investigation, whether it was in the data bank or whether it was in the missing files. But it is amazing how we constantly hear people inside the Justice Department saying that top officials were impeding their investigation rather than seeking the truth.

□ 1845

What is really disturbing here is that it is not as though as I recall it was just the year before this, that their drug czar was implicated and eventually had to come down. It was not like these were kind of off-the-wall charges that had never happened before in the Mexican government.

The gentleman from Florida has been establishing through this New York Times article that, while this person is a very driven person, he has established that he has some track record. This is a disturbing pattern we are seeing.

In fact, the gentleman read one statement a little bit ago that was also disturbing, because we often hear at the grassroots level, "why do you get the little guys and not the bigger guys?" The gentleman read a statement from this article that said that they were being limited by the Justice Department because, if the cash that they were having to do to move up the line was less than that they could actually close on at given point, which means that, by principle, we are defining we are only going to go for mid-range if we cannot keep leveraging the deal as we move up.

There are some fundamental questions here even as to how we approach this and do we really have the goal in our Justice Department to go after the top officials even when we have a strong tip. I think that, to some degree, this gets confusing as we move with it, but this is really disturbing, and I hope the gentleman from Florida will continue reading this into the RECORD and people will get copies of this because this is a fundamental at the heart of our policy right now in Mexico.

Mr. MICA. As they say in the mystery books, the plot thickens here. Let me continue if I may to read this into the RECORD. "In November of 1995, Colombian drug contacts introduced the undercover agents to Victor Alcala Navarro, a representative of Mexico's biggest drug mafia, the so-called Juarez cartel.

"The Customs agents, posing as money launderers from a dummy company called the Emerald Empire Corporation, began picking up the Mexican's profits and laundering them as planned.

"In February 1997, at meetings in Mexico, Javier Ramirez was introduced to Mr. Alcala's boss. A few months later, the Customs source found himself chatting by phone with the head of the cartel, Amado Carrillo Fuentes.

"Over scores of meetings and million-dollar deals, the traffickers grew

more open about the official protection they enjoyed in Mexico, law enforcement officials and government documents indicate.

"At one meeting in Mexico City on May 16, 1997, the traffickers took along 16 federal police agents as bodyguards." This is again police agents of Mexico acting as bodyguards for drug dealers. "At another meeting, a man who identified himself as an official of the Mexican Attorney General's office picked up \$1.7 million in cash, including \$415,000 that the undercover agents had carried to Mexico for the cartel boss himself.

"During a later meeting in New York, Mr. Alcala told the agents that like Mexico's drug enforcement chief, who had been arrested for collaborating with the Juarez cartel," again let me interject an aside here, much to the embarrassment of our United States drug czar who had embraced the Mexican drug czar, and here he is arrested "for collaborating with the Juarez cartel, the Defense Minister, General Cervantes, was in league with the competing Tijuana cartel."

But here we have allegations about the Attorney General, the former drug czar, and the Minister of Defense, and we have hundreds of thousands of dollars, \$1.7 million of cash being picked up by officials of the Mexican government.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICA. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, because what the gentleman just read here sounds eerily close to what happened in Colombia, only here we even have more direct involvement with the leaders in the government.

We have the drug enforcement chief, eventually who was proven guilty, who was actually renting an apartment from the head of the Juarez cartel while he was getting information from our government. The allegation is that the defense minister who was involved in helping bring down that cartel may be, we do not know this but this article is suggesting that we failed to pursue this, may be involved with the competing cartel just like the Cali cartel in Colombia helped bring down the Medellin cartel in Colombia because they wanted to put a rival out.

We have been hearing steadily on this floor and other bodies that the fact one way we can tell Mexico is cooperating is they helped bring down their drug czar. But what if, and we did not investigate this, they brought down their drug czar because another faction was a part in helping a different cartel?

I am not saying that is happening, but that is a really disturbing charge, because we would be played, for lack of a better word, as suckers in Congress if in fact we use as an argument for not doing decertification something which actually was a setup for a more powerful cartel.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, again the plot thickens here, and I want to continue reading from this investigative piece in today's New York Times.

"Customs officials said they remain skeptical of what the agents heard, including the traffickers' claim that Mr. Carrillo Fuentes's death in 1997 had actually been faked. But in December 1997, Javier Ramirez invited Mr. Alcala to Colombia for an elaborately staged meeting that seemed to raise that partnership to a new level." This meeting here with these folks. Let me continue.

"At a heavily guarded hacienda overlooking Bogota, an operative acting as Javier Ramirez's Colombian boss, Carlos, said he and his partners had \$500 million to launder," half a billion dollars to launder. "They wanted to know whether the Mexican bankers used by Mr. Alcala's boss, Juan Jose Castellanos Alvarez Tostado, could help.

"Alvarez called us right back," Mr. Gately recalled. 'He said, 'Let me send you my very best people, and we will get it done.'"

"On March 6, 1998," just about a year ago, "Mr. Alcala arrived with several businessmen at the tastefully furnished offices of Emerald Empire in a Los Angeles suburb. This time the businessmen offered a deal of their own.

"One of the men, David Loera, said he knew 'a general,' who had \$150 million in Mexico City to invest. Would Mr. Ramirez—who had told the traffickers he owned part of a Nevada casino used to launder money—care to help?

"Over the next six weeks, according to government documents," again let me read this, "over the next six weeks, according to government documents and the accounts of Mr. Gately and several officials, the deal was discussed in three more meetings and three more telephone conversations involving Mr. Ramirez, the undercover agents and the traffickers. All of the contacts were secretly tape-recorded and their words transcribed, officials said.

"In one call, two senior investment managers at Mexico's second largest bank told the Customs operatives that the money belonged not just to 'a general,' but to the Minister of Defense. Later, the two Mexicans advised Mr. Ramirez that the minister was sending 'his daughter' (a woman later said to be friend) to meet with them, along with an army colonel and a third person.

"However, the investment managers said, the amount to be laundered was much more than they had discussed: the minister had \$500 million in cash in New York and another \$500 million in the Netherlands, in addition to \$150 million in Mexico City.

"Customs officials said they queried the Central Intelligence Agency, which works closely with the Mexican military on drug control and other programs. The CIA responded that it had no such information about General Cervantes, an assessment that other officials have since reiterated.

"But although General Cervantes has not been a focus of suspicion, Mexican and American officials have said several senior generals close to him had been under the scrutiny of investigators from both the Mexican Attorney General's office and a special military intelligence unit.

"On February 6, analysts at the Drug Enforcement Administration briefed Attorney General Janet Reno on intelligence indicating that the senior Mexican generals might indeed be cooperating with Mr. Carrillo Fuentes' organization, officials said. And in a separate Customs case in Houston, undercover agents had been approached about laundering millions of dollars for an unidentified Mexican Army general, officials said."

Now listen to this, and again I quote from this article, "On April 9, Mr. Alcala visited Emerald Empire with a cousin, who had just returned from Mexico with a message. The cousin 'was very nervous about the deal,' Mr. Gately said. 'He said it could be very dangerous if it got screwed up, because the money belonged to, 'all of them, including the President.'"

The President, here it says Ernesto Zedillo. Then in parentheses, it says "(A spokesman for Mr. Zedillo, David Najera, dismissed the claim as baseless.)"

"Later that month, Mr. Gately went to Washington to brief officials including Mr. Kelly—who was then about to take over the Customs Service after having overseen it as Treasury Undersecretary for Enforcement.

"Kelly said, 'How do we know it's really him?' Mr. Gately recalled, referring to General Cervantes. 'I told him we do not know,' Mr. Gately said. 'We cannot substantiate it. But we have no reason to believe that they are telling us anything than what they know.'

"They weren't trying to impress us, they were not trying to make deals with us,' Mr. Gately added. 'So whoever had this money, I thought it was worth pursuing—whether it was the Defense Minister of Mexico or somebody we had never heard of.'

"People familiar with the discussions said they did not go much further. The general's supposed emissaries were to meet with Javier Ramirez in Las Vegas, Nevada on April 22. They did not arrive, and the traffickers reported they had become nervous.

Mr. Kelly acknowledged that he had been pressing for months to wrap up the investigation; he said he had grown increasingly concerned that information about it might be leaked out, endangering the undercover agents.

"The final sting had already been postponed twice because Federal prosecutors were still preparing indictments.

"James E. Johnson, who succeeded Mr. Kelly as Undersecretary and has closely supervised the Treasury's relations with Mexico on enforcement issues, added a cautionary note that several officials said seemed to underscore his concern for the political

stakes. Unless the agents had proof of general Cervantes's role, officials quoted him as warning, they should not bandy his name about in connection with the case.

"We need to be very careful about how we talk about this sort of thing,' a senior law enforcement official, who would not speak for attribution, quoted him as saying. 'If we don't have the goods, it makes us look like we're overreaching.'

"Mr. Johnson would not comment publicly."

"The operation had already navigated a series of sizable obstacles.

"Mr. Gately and some other agents were worried that their boss in Los Angeles, John Hensley, had leaked information about the secret operation to congressional aides and others; Mr. Hensley had also pressed hard to bring the operation to an end, officials said.

"For his part, officials said, Mr. Hensley had accused his strong-willed subordinate of transgressions ranging from traveling without authorization to stealing millions of dollars. Mr. Kelly alleged that the charges against Mr. Gately had been investigated and found baseless; Mr. Hensley declined to comment."

□ 1900

"As discussions about this supposed \$1.15 billion were going on, the undercover operation also suffered serious setbacks with the capture of an important Juarez operative in Chicago. The arrest brought money deliveries to a halt while the cartel hunted a mole.

"On May 16, more than two dozen Mexican traffickers, bankers and other operatives, who had been invited to the United States by the undercover team, were rounded up in San Diego at the Casablanca Casino Resort in Mesquite, Nevada. Officials said whatever thoughts they had entertained of pursuing the allegations about General Cervantes were dropped in the diplomatic backlash that followed."

And, again, I told my colleagues what the Mexicans did is they threatened to indict United States Customs officials.

"While the Mexican authorities were asked to arrest about 20 suspects indicted in the case, they initially located only 6. One was a partner of Mr. Loera, the fugitive businessman who had first proposed the deal with 'the general'. The partner was found dead in a Mexican jail from injuries that the police described as self-inflicted. Mr. Alvarez Tostado has never been found. His deputy, Mr. Alcala, awaits trial in Los Angeles.

"Soon after the operation, American officials said they revealed to the Mexican government some of their information on ostensible corruption in the case. They said they kept silent about more explosive evidence to avoid intensifying the furor that had followed their decision not to warn Mexico about the operation."

And this is the Casablanca operation.

"Still, the officials said none of the information was ever pursued, and in a little-noticed statement in July, the office of the Mexican Attorney General, Jorge Madrazo Cuellar, dismissed allegations of money laundering by 'senior commanders of the Army and officials of the Mexican government.'

"Mr. Madrazo said in a telephone interview that the Americans had told him only about unidentified Federal agents and a money laundering scheme involving 'a general who had a daughter'. He said the name of General Cervantes, who has no daughter, was never mentioned.

"With the information that they gave me, Mr. Madrazo asked, what could I possibly have done, gone and looked for a general with a daughter?"

And that was the response that we have out of the Attorney General and other officials of Mexico. So, basically, what this article outlines, and I read it in haste, but I wanted to make sure it was included in the record, what this article and this investigative report outlines is, in fact, we may have corruption at the very highest levels of the Mexican government.

This information is now public. We have known that there was very high levels of corruption. Here there are serious questions raised again that lead to a high minister's office all the way to the office of the President of Mexico.

We also see in this article a situation in which it appears that high United States officials stopped this investigation when it was disclosed that this corruption reached both the top of Mexican cabinet officials and possibly even reached the office of the President of Mexico, President Zedillo.

We also have here evidence tonight that the Mexican military, with whom the United States is confiding with in the war on drugs, is corrupt from the bottom to the very top. We must know who those generals are that are hoarding this kind of money in such an incredible fashion.

What else do we know? Those who reveal the truth about corruption in the Mexican government are found dead, and United States officials who attempt to reveal the truth about corruption are either deterred or they are penalized or they come under close scrutiny.

What else have we learned from this investigative report? United States officials, including the Attorney General, Secretary of State, and others may be risking our national security. And if we are losing 14,200 Americans from the effects of illegal narcotics, and 60 to 70 percent of those hard drugs are coming through Mexico, we know we have a national security problem of a huge proportion.

The information revealed by this New York Times report deserves further investigation. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources of the Committee on Government Reform,

I intend to investigate it. We will not be deterred in seeing how high this corruption leads to in the Mexican government. Wherever it may lead us, we will follow it, and we will find out why officials of the United States Government brought these investigations either to a close or did not pursue adequately these investigations with incredible allegations of this magnitude.

We will conduct those hearings and those meetings either in public or behind closed doors.

CONCLUSION OF DISCUSSION ON DRUGS

(Mr. SOUDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for a conclusion.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his cooperation, for coming out tonight and telling the American people about the situation we face with the corruption in Mexico, about the incredible volume of drugs that are coming across our border through Mexico, and about the apparent coverup and lack of investigation by this administration of corruption at the highest levels of Mexican government.

Mr. Speaker, I simply wished to say that we will hold hearings, we will investigate, and we will pursue this matter to the fullest extent. We will conduct hearings on this. Our subcommittee and other committees of Congress will act, and we will get the facts and information no matter where they lead us.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with the gentleman to find the truth. We do not know where the truth lies, but when we make foreign policy decisions on Mexico and China, we do not want to hear about coverups, we want to hear we are actually pursuing every lead to make sure we are doing things in the best national interests of the United States and not just trying to up our trade dollars making decisions otherwise.

I hope all this is false. I hope the top leaders of the Mexican government are completely clean. We need to work with them to eliminate our drug problem, but we have to know what the truth is.

INTRODUCTION OF THE RATEPAYER PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. STEARNS, is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce legislation with strong bipartisan support that will not only save American consumers billions of dollars. It will also remove a significant federal barrier to a more competitive electric power industry.

More than 20 years ago, the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act (PURPA) was enacted

as one of the original components of the Carter Energy Plan. Convinced that we were running out of natural gas and that the price of oil would soar to \$100 per barrel or even more by the year 2000, Congress passed PURPA to encourage conservation and promote the use of renewable fuels to generate electricity. It did this by establishing a special class of power generators known as qualifying facilities ("QF's") and it required utilities to buy all the electricity that these facilities wished to sell at a price determined generally by federal regulators and specifically by state regulators.

Congress sought, in drafting PURPA, to ensure that customers would pay no more for PURPA power than they would have to pay for other power. It did this by providing in PURPA that the maximum price for electricity from QF's would be the cost that the purchase utility would have incurred if it had generated the electricity itself or had purchased it from a source other than the QF. Unfortunately, this has not proven to be the case because government projections of utility avoided costs have been seriously in error. One recent study estimates that PURPA is costing electricity consumers nearly \$8 billion a year in excess power costs. Since over 60 percent of PURPA contracts will not expire until after the year 2010, consumers will continue to pay these excess costs well into the future.

PURPA also stands in the way of a more competitive electric industry. By granting special status to some electricity generators, but not others, PURPA encourages the creation of uneconomic projects just to qualify for PURPA benefits. Moreover, PURPA was premised on utilities continuing to be the exclusive suppliers of electricity to all consumers within their franchise territories. In many states today, customers have the ability to choose their own electric supplier. Requiring utilities to purchase new PURPA power when they may no longer have retail customers to whom they can resell power makes no sense.

With 20 years of experience behind us, it is clear that PURPA has outlived its usefulness. My legislation would do three things to reform PURPA: (1) It would prospectively repeal PURPA's mandatory purchase obligation on the date of enactment, so that there would no longer be any new obligations to purchase this power; (2) it would respect the sanctity of existing PURPA contracts; and (3) it would ensure that purchasing utilities would continue to be permitted to recover the costs of existing PURPA contracts as long as these contracts are in effect.

As I said upon introduction of virtually identical legislation during the last two Congresses, my only interest in introducing this bill lies in achieving the most efficient and most cost-effective means of electric generation for America's consumers. While it would prospectively repeal PURPA and would ensure that no new PURPA contracts would be required, it recognizes the legitimate current expectations of QF developers and utility purchasers. I believe that it represents a broad based consensus on this important issue and I would urge that this measure be included in whatever electric industry legislation might be considered by this Congress.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOYD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of illness.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Wednesday, March 17, on account of official business.

Mr. HOSTETTLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. PITTS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. McNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. CARSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Washington, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DOOLEY of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WISE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BLUMENAUER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, on March 17.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, today and on March 17.

Mr. HULSHOF, for 5 minutes, on March 17.

(The following Member (at the request of Mr. MICA) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. STEARNS, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 17, 1999, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1055. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of

Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Raisins Produced From Grapes Grown in California; Final Free and Reserve Percentages for 1998–99 Zante Currant Raisins [Docket No. FV99-989-3 IFR] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1056. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Noxious Weeds; Update of Weed Lists [Docket No. 98-063-2] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1057. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Azoxytobrin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300801; FRL-6064-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1058. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dicloran; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300806; FRL 6065-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1059. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Maneb (manganese ethylenebisdithio- carbamate); Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300809; FRL-6067-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1060. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pendimethalin; Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300804; FRL-6063-9] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1061. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Phase 2 Emission Standards for New Nonroad Spark-Ignition Nonhandheld Engines At or Below 19 Kilowatts (RIN: 2060-AE29) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1062. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Propiconazole; Establishment of Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-300810; FRL-6068-4] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1063. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Propiconazole; Extension of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP-300797; FRL-6064-2] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1064. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1065. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department has not yet completed the Plan for Re-

design of Military Pharmacy System; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1066. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Risk-Based Capital Standards; Construction Loans on Presold Residential Properties; Junior Liens on 1- to 4-Family Residential Properties; and Investments in Mutual Funds; Leverage Capital Standards; Tier 1 Leverage Ratio [Docket No. 98-125] (RIN: 1550-AB11) received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1067. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1068. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance [Docket No. FEMA-7708] received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1069. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Suspension of Community Eligibility [Docket No. FEMA-7707] received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1070. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Contractor Human Resource Management Programs—received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1071. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Documentation For Work Smart Standards Applications: Characteristics and Considerations—March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1072. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Scientific and Technical Information Management—received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1073. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation Of Implementation Plans Georgia: Approval of Revisions to the Georgia State Implementation Plan [GA-34-3-9819a; FRL-6306-2] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1074. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Pottsboro, Roxton and Whitesboro, Texas, and Durant, Leonard, Madill, and Sopher, Oklahoma) [MM Docket No. 98-63 RM-9209, RM-9392, RM-9393] received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1075. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Spencer and Webster, Massachusetts) [MM Docket No. 98-

174 RM-9356] received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1076. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.606(b), Table of Allotments, TV Broadcast Stations. (Kansas City, Missouri) [MM Docket No. 96-134, RM-8817] received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1077. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Brewster, Massachusetts) [MM Docket No. 98-58] (RM-9252) received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1078. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting a report relating to the Office of the Secretary of Defense; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1079. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting a listing of new investigations, audits, and evaluations; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1080. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Revision of Definitions of Overfishing, Maximum Sustainable Yield, and Optimum Yield for the Crab and Scallop Fisheries [I.D. 111798A] (RIN: 0648-AL89) received March 9, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1081. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Garden City, KS [Airspace Docket No. 98-ACE-59] received March 11, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BURTON. Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 807. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide portability of service credit for persons who leave employment with the Federal Reserve Board to take positions with other Government agencies; with an amendment (Rept. 106-53). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOSS. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 113. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 820) to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-54). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER. Committee on Rules. House Resolution 114. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 975) to provide for a reduction in the volume of steel imports, and to establish a steel import notification and monitoring program (Rept. 106-55). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 130. A bill to designate the United States Courthouse lo-

cated at 40 Centre Street in New York, New York as the "Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse" (Rept. 106-56). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 751. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 504 Hamilton Street in Allentown, Pennsylvania, as the "Edward N. Cahn Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; with amendments (Rept. 106-57). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 44. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 18th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; with an amendment (Rept. 106-58). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 47. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; with an amendment (Rept. 106-59). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 48. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the opening ceremonies of Sunrayce 99 (Rept. 106-60). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 49. Resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a bike rodeo to be conducted by the Earth Force Youth Bike Summit (Rept. 106-61). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 50. Resolution authorizing the 1999 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds (Rept. 106-62). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHUSTER. Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 52. Resolution authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts (Rept. 106-63). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SAXTON:

H.R. 1110. A bill to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MORELLA:

H.R. 1111. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to provide for the establishment of a program under which long-term care insurance is made available to Federal employees and annuitants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BAKER, Mr. KANJORSKI,

Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FROST, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. COOK, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. LEE, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FORD, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. HILL of Indiana, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 1112. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to authorize the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to insure mortgages for the acquisition, construction, or substantial rehabilitation of child care and development facilities and to establish the Children's Development Commission to certify such facilities for such insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. OSE (for himself, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. HERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. RADANOVICH):

H.R. 1113. A bill to assist in the development and implementation of projects to provide for the control of drainage, storm, flood and other waters as part of water-related integrated resource management, environmental infrastructure, and resource protection and development projects in the Colusa Basin Watershed, California; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BURTON of Indiana (for himself and Mr. LATOURETTE):

H.R. 1114. A bill to amend part S of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to permit the use of certain amounts for assistance to jail-based substance treatment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANADY of Florida (for himself, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. COBURN, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. COYNE, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. FROST, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. JENKINS, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHUGH, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. QUINN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. REGULA, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. SOUDER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. STARK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. WOLF, and Ms. WOOLSEY):

H.R. 1115. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the time limitation on benefits for immunosuppressive drugs under the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means,

and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 1116. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a graduated response to shrinking domestic oil and gas production and surging foreign oil imports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MORAN of Kansas (for himself, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 1117. A bill to provide relief from unfair interest and penalties on refunds retroactively ordered by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CAMPBELL (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia):

H.R. 1118. A bill to provide increased funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Programs, to resume the funding of the State grants program of the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to provide for the acquisition and development of conservation and recreation facilities and programs in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CARDIN (for himself, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. COYNE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DOGGETT, and Mr. STARK):

H.R. 1119. A bill to enable a greater number of children to receive child care services, and to improve the quality of child care services; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN (for himself and Mr. HOUGHTON):

H.R. 1120. A bill to modify the standards for responding to import surges under section 201 of the Trade Act of 1974, to establish mechanisms for import monitoring and the prevention of circumvention of United States trade laws, and to strengthen the enforcement of United States trade remedy laws; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H.R. 1121. A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 18 Greenville Street in Newnan, Georgia, as the "Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CRANE (for himself and Mr. MATSUI):

H.R. 1122. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to more accurately codify the depreciable life of printed wiring board and printed wiring assembly equipment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts (for himself and Mr. CAMPBELL):

H.R. 1123. A bill to exclude grants for student financial assistance from the prohibition on certain departments and agencies of the Government making grants to institutions of higher education that prevent ROTC access to campus or military recruiting on campus; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HILL of Montana:

H.R. 1124. A bill to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System in the State of Montana, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. KUCINICH (for himself and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 1125. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to increase the penalties for infringing the rights pertaining to famous performing groups and to clarify the law pertaining to the rights of individuals who perform services as a group; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, and Mr. WEINER):

H.R. 1126. A bill to require newly-constructed multifamily housing in New York City to comply with the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. MCCRERY (for himself and Mr. WATKINS):

H.R. 1127. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude income from the transportation of oil and gas by pipeline from subpart F income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RUSH, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. OLVER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LAFALCE, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1128. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to facilitate the immigration to the United States of certain aliens born in the Philippines or Japan who were fathered by United States citizens; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 1129. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 60-month limitation period on the allowance of a deduction of interest on loans for higher education expenses; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOAKLEY (for himself, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. BOEH-LERT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. OLVER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. NADLER, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. OWENS, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. FORD):

H.R. 1130. A bill to direct the Consumer Product Safety Commission to promulgate fire safety standards for cigarettes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 1131. A bill to amend the Bank Protection Act of 1968 and the Federal Credit Union Act to require enhanced security measures at depository institutions and automated teller machines sufficient to provide surveillance pictures which can be used effectively as evidence in criminal prosecutions, to amend title 28, United States Code, to require the Federal Bureau of Investigation to

make technical recommendations with regard to such security measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 1132. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act and Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide coverage for annual screening mammography for women 40 years of age or older if the coverage or plans include coverage for diagnostic mammography; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 1133. A bill to provide for comprehensive reform for managed health care plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

H.R. 1134. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act with respect to restrictions on changes in benefits under MedicareChoice plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, and Mr. LINDER):

H.R. 1135. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to complete a land exchange with Georgia Power Company; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NORWOOD (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, and Mr. WELDON of Florida):

H.R. 1136. A bill to increase the availability and choice of quality health care; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POMEROY:

H.R. 1137. A bill to amend Public Law 89-108 to increase authorization levels for State and Indian tribal, municipal, rural, and industrial water supplies, to meet current and future water quantity and quality needs of the Red River Valley, to deauthorize certain project features and irrigation service areas, to enhance natural resources and fish and wildlife habitat, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. STEARNS (for himself, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BOEH-LERT, Ms. DUNN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. BOYD, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. MICA, and Mrs. THURMAN):

H.R. 1138. A bill to prospectively repeal section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. TAUSCHER (for herself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. FROST, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. CARDIN, Mr.

CLAY, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BUCHER, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. CAPPS, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. DIXON, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. HOYER, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KANJORSKI, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNULTY, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1139. A bill to make child care more affordable for working families and for stay-at-home parents with children under the age of 1, to double the number of children receiving child care assistance, to provide for after-school care, and to improve child care safety and quality and enhance early childhood development; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Banking and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. THURMAN:

H.R. 1140. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health and Human Services to make payments to hospitals under the Medicare Program for costs associated with training psychologists; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.J. Res. 39. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting the right to a home; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.J. Res. 40. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the budgetary treatment of the Federal programs currently known as the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the hospital insurance program; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL of Indiana (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. REYES, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. HOLDEN, Ms. DANNER, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts,

Mr. LEACH, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BALDACC, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. FROST, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. GUTIERREZ):

H. Res. 115. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a postage stamp should be issued recognizing the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. NADLER:

H. Res. 116. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require a bill or joint resolution which amends a law to show the change in the law made by the amendment, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H. Res. 117. A resolution expressing Support for a National Week of Reflection and Tolernace; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. TIAHRT (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. HYDE, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. BUYER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. KING, Mr. DELAY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. PITTS, Mr. COBURN, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, and Mr. ENGLISH):

H. Res. 118. A resolution reaffirming the principles of the Programme of Action of the International Conference on Population and Development with respect to the sovereign rights of countries and the right of voluntary and informed consent in family planning programs; to the Committee on International Relations.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 33: Mr. BOYD, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. MICA.

H.R. 44: Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. KILDEE.

H.R. 51: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 65: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 70: Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 72: Mr. SPENCE and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 116: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 163: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 198: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 216: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 219: Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 220: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 263: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PORTMAN, and Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 303: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. STUPAK, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 306: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 323: Mr. NEY, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 330: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 347: Mr. SKEEN and Mr. CHAMBLISS.

H.R. 351: Mr. TAUZIN and Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 352: Mr. OXLEY, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. MOORE, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 354: Mr. DELAHUNT and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 355: Mr. NEY, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. BALDACC, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PICKERING, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 357: Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 362: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 363: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 364: Mr. JEFFERSON and Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 365: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 366: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 370: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 371: Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mrs. BONO, Mr. BARCIA, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. INSLEE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. LEACH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 380: Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 389: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 398: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 407: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. SHOWS.

H.R. 417: Ms. LEE and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 430: Mr. CANADY of Florida and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 464: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mrs. NORTUP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, and Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 472: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 492: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 500: Mr. PICKERING.

H.R. 506: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 531: Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 534: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 541: Mr. VENTO, Ms. CARSON, Mr. MOORE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 544: Mrs. JONES of Ohio.

H.R. 557: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 564: Mr. DOOLITTLE.

H.R. 566: Mr. WYNN, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 621: Mr. ENGLISH and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 625: Mr. WYNN and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 628: Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. FORBES, Mr. HUNTER, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 632: Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 642: Mr. STARK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 643: Mr. STARK, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. DIXON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. POMBO, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 670: Mr. DEFAZIO and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 684: Mr. DICKS, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 685: Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 689: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 708: Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 716: Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 732: Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BROWN of California, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 735: Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 745: Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 750: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 764: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. FROST, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr.

OxLEY, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. WISE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. MATSUI, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 772: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. FROST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BALGOJEVICH, Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. CARSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 775: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SESSIONS.

H.R. 783: Mr. BURTON of Indiana and Mr. SANDERS.

H.R. 784: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. PICKERING, and Mr. JENKINS.

H.R. 791: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 795: Mr. HAYWORTH.

H.R. 832: Mr. FARR of California and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 837: Mrs. CAPPS and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 844: Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MCCREY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. DUNN, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 845: Mr. WEXLER and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 850: Mr. BONILLA, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. KING, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. RILEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. HILLEARY.

H.R. 853: Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. UPTON, Mr. CAMPBELL, and Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 858: Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mr. HORN.

H.R. 860: Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 884: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. CLAY, Mr. WU, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 886: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 896: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 904: Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. JOHN.

H.R. 936: Mr. LARGENT.

H.R. 941: Mr. CRAMER, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. McHUGH, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 959: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 960: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. LAFALCE, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 976: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. DICKS, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. OLVER, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. McNULTY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FROST, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 987: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. MILLER of Florida, and Mr. NORWOOD.

H.R. 1008: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1034: Mr. SISISKY.

H.R. 1040: Mr. SANFORD.

H.R. 1041: Mr. COBLE, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MCKEON, and Mr. TALENT.

H.R. 1046: Mr. SANDERS and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1071: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 1082: Mr. HOFFEL, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTSCH, Ms. BERKLEY, and Mrs. KELLY.
H.R. 1106: Mr. CANADY of Florida and Mr. WEXLER.

H.J. Res. 14: Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BILEY, Mr. CRANE, and Mr. HORN.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. BALDACCIO and Mr. PICKERING.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. JOHN and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. HORN, and Mr. MICA.

H. Con. Res. 24: Mr. SABO, Mr. OWENS, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GOODE, Mr. ISTOOK, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H. Con. Res. 30: Mr. ADERHOLT and Mr. TIAHRT.

H. Con. Res. 31: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. VENTO, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. KELLY, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H. Con. Res. 47: Mr. WOLF.

H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H. Con. Res. 54: Mr. MASCARA, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. OLVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H. Res. 35: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. CARDIN, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Res. 41: Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TIAHRT, and Mr. WYNN.

H. Res. 92: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H. Res. 97: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. BONIOR, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.

H. Res. 99: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. KING, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BONILLA, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H. Res. 105: Mr. DIXON, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H. Res. 106: Mr. KING, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SUNUNU, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.